



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600010168M





THE
PRE-EXISTENCE
OF
OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR
JESUS CHRIST,
AS DECLARED IN THE
SCRIPTURES OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.
WITH
OCCASIONAL REFERENCES TO THE OPINIONS OF BOTH
JEWS AND HEATHENS UPON THIS SUBJECT.
BY
JOSEPH ALDERSON, M.A.
RECTOR OF HEVINGHAM, AND RECTOR OF OXWICK, NORFOLK.

LONDON:
T. CADELL, STRAND;
AND W. BLACKWOOD, EDINBURGH.

MDCCCXXXII.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY J. DAVY, QUEEN STREET, SEVEN DIALS.



P R E F A C E.

THE object proposed in making the following sentiments public, is to call the attention of those who read and love the word of God to the Person and the wonderful work of his Son Jesus Christ. Publication however was not the design when they were first written. They were the production of leisure hours, and were intended to review and so to ascertain how far the opinions, which had thus a bodily form given them, were consistent with themselves, and agreeable to the Scriptures, according to the light and knowledge vouchsafed to him who now presents them to the world. He is aware that he differs on most of the topics discussed in these pages from the generality of his contemporaries, and as far as his limited research extends, from all that have left their sentiments on record. Neither the establishment of a system, nor the recommendation of a curious novelty, is the motive which has prompted the present measure. Besides recording what the Author believes to be the legitimate result of comparing Scripture with Scripture, he wishes to

To these several characters, viz. to those who are the ministering servants of the Most High God, to them who reject the counsel of God as revealed in his word, and to them who are of the seed of Abraham, the contents of the ensuing pages are dedicated in love and with earnest prayer, that they may be made the means of their growing in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The first are affectionately desired to take heed to whom and to what they lend the ear of instruction, in qualifying themselves for the sacred office. It will be profitable to them to turn their eyes inwardly upon themselves while they read, that there are some "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth," as it relates to Him who is made Lord of all, ruling in the armies of heaven, and over the inhabitants of the earth, to whom no height is unknown, and from whom no depth is concealed. That Spirit which taught the Apostles, who their compassionate and loving Master was before he emptied himself of his ancient glory, and what he became when he dwelt among men, hath not forsaken the earth, but is still nigh unto all that seek to learn of Him the truth as it is in Jesus. To this Teacher they are earnestly directed that they may grow in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, through the word which holy men of old, moved by the Holy Ghost, have recorded, and which is preserved by his power and grace for their instruction in righteousness.

From men who intrude into things which they

have not seen, who when they speak understand not what they say, nor whereof they affirm, they are desired in the spirit of love to cease, for wherein are such to be accounted of? "Great men are not *always* wise, neither do the aged *always* understand judgment." "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings the Lord our God hath ordained strength." So it seemeth good in his sight. Ye see then your calling. It is to "call no man Master." To "examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith," to "prove your own selves," not by the creed of men but by the Scriptures of truth. You, Brethren, are invited to a new study, viz. to an examination of your present principles, to a new and more accurate consideration of that Divine Book, whose contents have been unhappily employed in propagating discord, instead of promoting unity and peace amongst mankind. The fetters of prejudices imposed by early education, and rivetted more closely by undue respect to the talents and attainments of succeeding teachers in riper years, must be broken off. You are exhorted to think for yourselves, while meditating on the contents of the Holy Volume, which alone is able to make wise unto salvation; to use the faculty of reason on determining what it sets forth as the mind and will of Jehovah, and not to unite yourselves with them who domineer over the consciences of God's heritage, in requiring implicit faith in the conclusions which are drawn from the dictation of fellow men, rather than from a consistent interpretation of the revelation which has been made by the Holy Ghost. Revelation is the source

of that knowledge which inspires fallen man with a well-grounded hope of happiness in "a kingdom which cannot be moved." But "the things [all the things] which are revealed, belong to us, and to our Children": and the anticipated possession of this glorious and indefeasible inheritance can be obtained only by a right exercise of that faculty, which shews how we had once forfeited, and by what means we are restored to, the favour of a God of love and mercy. Revelation alone can first declare the plan of redemption, and the language by which Revelation unfolds to the enraptured heart of man the free grace boon of salvation, is the language of nature. To understand aright the precepts of this instructress, to follow her with confidence and success in the varied paths by which she makes man to emerge from the caverns of darkness and despair, and leads him to the regions of abounding peace and rapturous joy, something more than the perceptions of animal being are requisite. The brute beast without a rational understanding can benefit from the productions of Nature's ample field, but his happiness and his acquisitions are limited to the body that perishes. Nature has no further voice to him than what calls to the indulgence of animal gratification. With a body that requires similar support, Man is moreover endowed with an immortal spirit, which not only must have its appropriate food, but is ordained to receive it through the mediation of the same subject matter which administers to his bodily comfort and preservation. Revelation applies to the inward man's consolation all the promises of spiri-

tual relief and support, of restoration from spiritual disease, and of a firm establishment in a state of unceasing spiritual well-being; and applies them in a way, of which man can not only feel its fitness, but acknowledge its propriety. As no wish remains ungratified, no want unsupplied to the outward man, in this material world, so Revelation proclaims that no desire shall be unfulfilled, no blessing be withheld in the world of spirits to the inward man. To effect this, Revelation employs the terms which express the hopes and desires, the pleasures and griefs, the diseases and remedies of the common animal nature of rational man, and of the brute that hath no understanding. Through these the inward man is made acquainted with those pleasures for evermore which are to succeed to his present ills, with that sure remedy which is to heal all his spiritual diseases, and is put in full possession of that lively, blessed, and stedfast hope, which is the object of the desires of a renewed heart. In a word, Nature is the ground-work of Revelation, and Revelation employs the language of Nature to give peace to them who know not the way of peace, and to confirm them therein that are brought nigh to God. But where and how are they who minister in holy things to obtain a right view of Revelation as producing this effect? The Author unhesitatingly asserts, in making the Hebrew language the Alpha and Omega of their studies. "Search the [Hebrew] Scriptures, for they are they that testify of Jesus." The Hebrew language is founded on Natural Ideas, and the whole bearing of the Hebrew Scriptures is

to transfer those Ideas to Spiritual objects. "The invisible things of God [in his redemption of sinners by Jesus Christ] ever since the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by [and only by] the things that are made." Ye servants of the Most High God, cease from those men who would decry the necessity or utility of the Hebrew Oracles in revealing Christ Jesus in you the hope of Glory. "Meditate upon these things, give yourself wholly to them, that your profiting may appear unto all."

To the second description of persons the Author would turn with earnest affection, deeply deploring the captivity in which they are held by the chains of Nature's ignorance and obstinacy. Seeing them hastening to the brink of the horrible pit of Infidelity in which so many have been engulfed never to emerge, the Author would, while he warns them by the awful judgments which have been individually and nationally inflicted on them who have "set at nought all the counsels of God, and would none of his reproof," invite them also to consider what Scripture saith of the Origin and Person of the great Prophet, Priest, and King, who left the bosom of the Father, to teach men the way of truth, to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to rule in peace and righteousness over them whom he should make willing in the day of his power to acknowledge, as the constituted Lord, Redeemer, and Judge of the Children of Men. Where, Men, Brethren, he would say, do you go for instruction in Righteousness? Is it to the Scriptures of truth? Yield then no longer

your understandings to the fetters of a system which you have cunningly devised. A system which perverts the right way of the Lord. A system which is at variance with itself, as well as with the simplicity of the pure and undefiled religion of the One and True God. Search ye in the first place the Hebrew Scriptures, neither leaning to your own understandings, nor suffering your judgment to be warped by the deceptions of self-will, or self-conceit. You justly condemn the creeds which men, led by a spirit of perverseness, have pretended to deduce from the Volume of the Book. But because they have erred in some points, does it follow that they are in possession of no part of the Truth? Because they have marred the simplicity of the Character, Person, and Offices of the Pre-existent Redeemer, are you to conclude that "Jehovah possessed Him" not, as "The Beginning," "his Way," in saving sinners? If there are many in our modern Thessalonica who receive not this word, ye can be justified no other way than in imitating those who are more noble, and in searching like them the Hebrew Scriptures whether those things are so. If they have erred in rejecting or misapplying some part of the truth as it is in Jesus, will ye escape condemnation who trample on that blood, without which there is no remission? If they have misstated in some important points the character of that only "name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," what hope can ye have without him, who of God is made unto us Wisdom and Righteousness, and Sanctification and Redemption?

To the third description of persons, the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, a people that walk in darkness, that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, without the God of their Fathers, and therefore without peace or hope, it is designed to shew Him in all his pristine glory to their view, who while he is appointed "a light to lighten the Gentiles," is constituted the peculiar "glory of his people Israel." To you, Brethren, would a Gentile speak in terms of meekness and gentleness, inviting you to turn your eyes on your own Scriptures to see that Messiah whom you love, and for whom you sigh day and night, without knowing that he has already visited the earth, and has, after making an end of sin-offerings by the One offering of his own body on the Tree, ascended into heaven, from whence he had descended. He invites you to behold not a new Light, for "there is no new *thing* under the Sun," but to contemplate the writings of Moses and the prophets in the same spirit as those holy men of God by whom they were transmitted to us. That blindness has happened unto you cannot be denied. You know and confess it. But how is it to be removed? Not by hardening your hearts as the Fathers in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness, rejecting the counsel of God concerning themselves in his written word. Not by joining yourselves to the assembly of your brethren in the flesh, or of them who call themselves by the name of your Messiah, who are satisfied with the interpretations of men to the mar-
ring of all Scripture consistency, and the quench-

ing of the light of Israel. You, in common with both the other characters, are exhorted to oppose yourselves to the overwhelming torrents of self-will and self-sufficiency that threaten to make a wreck of all that has upheld the hopes and cheered the spirits of man, in his passage through this dark vale, to the regions of light and unchangeable happiness. You, in common with them, are to be warned that, through a general corruption or disregard of the Truth as it is in Jesus, an Infidel Spirit is now spread wider than ever over the face of the earth. Through its reckless defiance of all ancient authority, Divine or human, every throne in both the Hemispheres is trembling to its foundation. The next general commotion of the kingdoms of the earth, and the forebodings of that dreadful day declare it to be at no great distance, will be one not of nation against nation, as heretofore, but the deadlier conflict of opinions, which will array city against city, family against family, and man against man. Who shall stand when the Lord cometh to judge the world in righteousness? Who may abide the day of his coming?

To neutralize as far as shall be permitted the baneful poison of Infidelity, which is spreading its influence throughout every class of society, is the great object of the succeeding pages. And to incite the reader to a dispassionate consideration of the arguments and elucidations which they contain, he is referred to the corruptions which in the first and succeeding ages of Christianity brought down the judgments of God on the Church, and whose over-

whelming tide is now rolling its waves towards the shores of every civilized nation, threatening to involve all that is just and honourable, all that is lovely and sacred, in one common destruction. The recollection of this melancholy subject, may dispose some patiently to peruse the following work, which presumes to point out the leading, or rather fundamental feature in these corruptions, as well as to suggest the means of their correction.

None will deny that Corruptions have been and still exist in the Church of Christ. Are they who witness such abominations obliged to acquiesce in them? The Church of England, with a liberality unknown to Papists or Dissenters, does not require it. It does not make it a crime to point them out. It annexes no censure if done in a right way and spirit, that is with a design to exalt the glory of God in a consistent interpretation of his word—Let Art. VI. and XX. speak on this subject.

Art. VI. *Of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation.* “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.” So much for the good sense of our Reformers in discarding infallibility from man and resting it on the word of God: So much for the *Litera Scripta* as the foundation and the only foundation of what can be required of any man to believe as an article of the Faith, or be made requisite to salvation. But the Church of England in Art. XX.

has resigned every claim as a collective body of Bible Students to a superiority of discrimination, or paramount right of determining the sense of any controversy in doctrine, &c. She declares that "it is unlawful" so to expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. "Wherefore although that Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation." Individual investigation and individual resolution of difficulties by the talents vouchsafed through the grace of God is left in full force. Each is to think for himself and give an account to God of the result of his investigations. To his own Master he must stand or fall. To the Church he has no account to give when it so expounds one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Of this every Man is to be judge for himself. The Church liberally, wisely, and in the spirit of the Reformers, has granted this boon to her Children. How these rights of private judgment have been so long set at nought, the History of a Church apostatized in Spirit and practice for a continued series of years will point out. The Church of England has groaned for a long period under corruptions of no common Character. Liberty is at length "proclaimed to the captive and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." Men are not compelled, *jurare in verba magistri*, "to call any man master." "The snare is broken and we are escaped." Most happily for an inquisitive age, and one determined not to be entangled

any longer in the fetters of a Church, which under artful and it is feared unprincipled men were entrapped to believe those to be her dogmata which both the Letter and Spirit bore ample testimony to be otherwise. The Act of Uniformity with a plainness and clearness hardly to be surpassed, having in its beginning made its object most apparent, viz. to call upon and require its members to “declare their unfeigned Assent and Consent to the Use of every thing contained in the Book of Common Prayer,” are afterwards in a mutilated Formulary individually called upon and required upon pain of forfeiting any participation both in the Services or Emoluments of the Established Church, to “declare their unfeigned Assent and Consent to all things contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and not simply to the use of them.” Making these to be doctrines and articles of Belief which the act only intended to be a guide to uniformity in practice. None but Papists will demand a uniformity of Faith in Mankind. Men of Reflection will know it to be an impossibility. A right knowledge of what is revealed in the Scriptures is the greatest blessing which man can enjoy. And wherever the course of this knowledge is obstructed, the Glory of God can be promoted, and the edification of the Church advanced, only by those who are instructed in the Kingdom of God giving information to them that are in ignorance. Political and prudential considerations may be urged against inquiring into the Corruptions of our Holy Faith. But on such grounds the sacred truths of the Gospel must always be suppressed. Besides,

the origin of the Protestant Religion had its first rise in the inquiry after the Corruptions that had crept into the Church of God. This led to the discovery of what was contrary to God's word, and to an extensive acknowledgment and correction of the same, though often at the hazard of the lives of the Reformers. Nor can it be supposed by Protestants that there are no errors remaining to be corrected, when it is unanimously asserted by them that Infallibility belongs only to Jesus Christ, the great Head and Apostle of their profession. The Church of England has in fact altered its opinions on some leading points even since the days of the Reformation. Are not the third and seventeenth Articles very generally disavowed? And will it be a matter of surprise, that alterations in what was once deemed fundamental, should be pronounced necessary in the present day of increasing light? It ought not to excite surprise if at any time such a proposal should be made, when the encouragement is considered which the Legislature has long since given to Free Inquiry. Expediency may timidly suggest a limited boundary within which the search after pure Truth is to be confined: but Faith will fearlessly affirm, and the Church of England will confirm the assertion, that a simple and unrestricted search after pure Truth, is in every case and upon every subject the only path of safety and honour.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

Ignorance of the meaning of the Hebrew word בָּרָא, of the Greek κτίω, and of the English "Create," one cause of the rejection of the Doctrine of the Pre-existence of the Saviour Jesus Christ as a Man.

CHAP. II.

The necessity of ascertaining in what Humanity does or does not consist, before it can be determined whether the Saviour Jesus Christ had a Pre-existence as a Man.

CHAP. III.

An examination of the following words עולם—עלם—עד—אין—קדם—נצח—αιδιος, αιων, generally referred to as ascertaining the character and actions of Jesus Christ to be such as belong to Deity, will establish the doctrine of Jesus Christ's Pre-existence as a Man.

CHAP. IV.

The Incarnation of Jehovah. The Hebrew language alone can lead to a right investigation of this subject. The recovery of a long lost Canon of the Greek language on the Definitive Article, confirms the view taken of the Incarnation of Jehovah, and further establishes the doctrine of Jesus Christ's Pre-existence as a Man.

CHAP. V.

Attention to what constitutes Humanity, or a due distinction between the Essence of Man and the Form under which he appears, necessary to a right knowledge of the Person of the Saviour Jesus Christ. The term Son of God denotes the Person of the Saviour Jesus Christ in that which constitutes his Essence or real Humanity. It denotes also the Form or Outward Appearance which is seen on Earth.

CHAP. VI.

דבר, Λογος, "Word," not appellations of Jehovah, but as their radical signification proves, intended to designate the instrument by whom Jehovah makes known his will and designs, and works all his works in and towards his creatures in heaven and in earth.

CHAP. VII.

The terms "Jesus," "Christ," taken singly, or in connection "Jesus Christ," are erroneously applied to Jehovah. They are each indicative of a Man, have no allusion to Jehovah; but are in opposition or in contradistinction to Him.

CHAP. VIII.

Texts which speak immediately of the Pre-existent Human Saviour Jesus Christ. Conclusion.

THE
PRE-EXISTENCE
OF
OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST.

CHAPTER I.

THE existence of erroneous notions on the most important points of the Christian faith, is not more notorious than the ill success of the various attempts which have been made to establish the truth as it is in Jesus. Ignorance of the Revelation which Jehovah has made, is confessedly the origin of all error; but men are not agreed upon what that ignorance is founded. When any new substance is discovered in the fossil or mineral kingdom, it is carefully analyzed with a view of detecting its component parts. All outward forms in which it appears to agree with things well known, and with which it may be confounded, are disregarded, until the tests which are employed determine, that it varies only in appearance from what has been long known to men of science, or that it is totally dissimilar in its original or fundamental character and principles from every thing which they have hitherto examined. Experiments are multiplied to ascertain these principles, especially if the supposed new material is possessed of powerful and active qualities, before it is used in the ornamental arts, or added to the materia medica of the physician. In this way ignorance, as far as the labour

and sagacity of man can effect, is done away, and all injury to the health and prosperity of society is prevented. It would have been happy for the Christian world if similar caution had been always employed in excluding ignorance, on the momentous points upon which its peace and comfort so much depend; if there had been at all times equal diligence used in investigating the elements of our holy faith; and if nothing had been suffered to pass as orthodox, but what had been proved, by the most satisfactory tests, to be in perfect harmony with that faith, and with those principles, on which the Christian verity is founded. But the children of light are not so wise in their generation as the children of this world.

The doctrine of the Pre-existence of the Saviour as a Man, has of late been recommended to the attention of Christians, as not only connected with the foundation of their profession, but as forming an essential part of it. The generality of the Christian world has not given it a favorable reception, from an apprehension that it is Arianism in disguise, and likely to lead to Socinianism. But upon what ground does such an opinion rest, and what support does it receive from the volume of Inspiration rightly understood or consistently interpreted? It may be urged, with no small confidence, that ignorance of the Scriptures in which this doctrine is revealed, and in some instances of the words that are employed to express and maintain it, give occasion to the ill will with which men of acknowledged piety bear it announced, and to the want of courtesy with which they so often reject it.

An examination of those Scriptures, and of some of the words alluded to, may possibly shew that the opposition made on this point, is founded more on the effects which early prejudices have instilled, than on the consequences which a sound judgment has established: and that a want of due attention to the proper and real meaning of the words themselves, according to the nature of things, as well as according to the internal evidence which the words contain of their own

signification, has not only given rise to the erroneous opinions which Christians have of this doctrine, but has occasioned that perseverance in them, that resists alike the testimony of the senses, and the force of arguments, which on any other subject would carry immediate conviction with them.

There is no prejudice so difficult to be removed as that which has been imbibed in our early years, especially when sanctioned by the wise and good. The past experience which history furnishes, of fallibility in the best and most learned of men in their generation, and of the disastrous consequences proceeding from it, is utterly lost. The admonitions of Holy Writ, such as, "Cease from man—wherein is he to be accounted of," are equally unavailing. It is however promised, that in "the time of the end, many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." And as this period is evidently not very far distant, if not already begun, the Bible student is encouraged to hope, that it will not be deemed presumption in him to declare all that he has reason to believe is revealed in the Scriptures: leaving it to the Lord to prosper this or that, as it shall tend to further his kingdom, and establish his glory on the earth.

The very general agreement of the learned, that the Hebrew word בָּרָא, the Greek κτίω, and the English "create," mean "to produce being from a state of non-entity," or to bring things into first existence, is one of the most striking instances in which man is seen to give up his understanding to early and unfounded prejudices. It occurs to few that they can no more think, than they can speak, without words: and it occurs to still fewer, when they discourse of words, and of the senses which they bear, that words have, or ought to have no other signification attributed to them, than what the things or actions for which they are signs or substitutes evidently contain. Yea more, that when conclusions are drawn in relation to Jehovah's Essence and Works, if there is No Thing on which the senses of man can exercise themselves, to declare or set forth his essence and works,

there can be No Word to express them. If this had been attended to, opposing and contradictory senses would not have been given to the words בָּרָא, κτίζω, "create"; and Christians would not have stumbled, as they do now of necessity, when the common acceptation of these words is received without reflection, at the threshold of the door, which opens the way to the knowledge of the Pre-existent Saviour, the Man Jesus Christ.

It is asserted that בָּרָא signifies the "production both of substance and form." Of course, by the "production of substance" is intended a "production into being from a state of non-entity." Now what thing, the object of the human senses, is there, which is in the state of immediate production out of a state of non-entity? If there be none, there can be no word to express that thing or act: for words are the clothing of our ideas, and all our ideas arise from things, or the actions of things, which are the objects of our senses. But there is No Thing except atoms * which is in the state of immediate production out of non-entity; and these, from their very essence, are not the objects of our senses. Therefore it follows that there is no word to express the production of being out of non-entity.†

* It should be recollected that the word Atom is a negative term. It says no more than that "something is incapable of division." It gives no intimation what that thing is. As there are bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial, so there were original particles of matter in the heavens and the earth differing in their essence, of which these bodies were composed. But these particles were Atoms, and as such necessarily altogether unknown. In their concentered or accreted condition they present to us form, by which our senses obtain a knowledge, not of their essence, but of their various qualities, according to which they have a name given to them.

† It is well known that the soul, or inward man, must receive its information through the bodily senses: that when the senses have acted on any thing, that act is called Perception: that what we retain of that act, is called an Idea, or inward sense of the thing. It is equally well known that words are the substitutes of the ideas obtained through the bodily senses. It follows, therefore, of necessity, that we must not only understand the natural characters or qualities of the things on

It may truly be inferred, that as matter cannot be without beginning, Jehovah must have brought out of non-entity into its first state, whatever it is on which man does or can exercise his senses: but this is not revealed, and for this powerful reason, that, according to the constituted means of conveying knowledge to man, viz. by visible things, for which words are substitutes, it is impossible. We may say that Jehovah did produce the substance of all things, with which we are conversant, from a state of non-entity; yet, while we are making the assertion, we can form no idea of what we so confidently and so truly assert. This is among the "secret things which belong unto Jehovah our Aleim": and humility, as well as wisdom, are never more conspicuous, than when the profoundest silence is kept on what is beyond the limits of our understanding. But form, which in the first instance was the concretion of the primordial atoms, being produced, and the new modelling in endless variety of matter so produced becoming the subject of our daily experience, we can readily understand what the production of form means, viz. the concretion or accretion of matter already in being. This is the radical sense of the Hebrew ברא, and no signification in opposition to this can be given without an offence against the genius of the Hebrew language.*

The first instance in which the word ברא occurs, viz. Gen i. 1, is brought as a proof of the sense generally attributed, and pronounced to be properly belonging to it, viz. of "producing being from a state of non-entity." "In the

which the bodily senses act, but that the things themselves must have an existence before the bodily senses can act upon them. If then there be No Thing which is in the condition of immediate production from a state of Non-entity, the senses can have no object on which to exercise themselves, no ideas can be raised from them, and no words or substitutes for such ideas can have a being.

* The LXX. translate ברא by *τοιμαζω*, *κατασκευαζω*, both meaning "to prepare, make ready"; *τιζω*, "to form"; *ποιω*, "to make." Why should *τιζω* be supposed to have a sense so different to the other three Greek words?

beginning Aleim brought into being from a state of non-entity the heavens and the earth." It is urged that ברא cannot here relate to form, because it immediately follows, that the "earth was without form," תהו in Atoms. A misunderstanding of the first word in the verse appears to have led to this error, which a misunderstanding of two others has confirmed. בראשית is taken for granted to indicate that moment, to speak after the manner of men, when Jehovah from a state of sole existence began to act *ad extra*, and produced from a state of non-entity what is termed "the heavens and the earth." The Septuagint translators, who have rendered בראשית εν αρχη, "in the beginning," have also translated ברא by ποιησεν, "made." If their version be approved of in the first instance, and it is generally allowed, why is it not also as generally allowed in the second? The authority which is sufficient to establish εν αρχη "in the beginning," ought to be deemed sufficient to establish ποιησεν "made." But if ποιησεν never means to "produce into being from a state of non-entity," and the most strenuous advocates for this sense of ποιησεν acknowledge that it does not except by implication, which is giving up the point, why should not the authority of the Septuagint translators, which leads to the acceptance of the word בראשית as signifying "in the beginning," lead also to the acceptance of ברא as signifying to "make," or form from pre-existing materials? בראשית however does not appear to mean "in the beginning" exclusively, but like another word of similar termination, viz. ברית, which has been equally misunderstood, points to a creature of the highest rank, even the Pre-existent Man, Jesus Christ. He was ראשית, "the Beginning," the first of all creatures; and "by" him Aleim formed, not produced from a state of non-entity, the heavens and the earth. The language of David is expressly to this purpose in Ps. civ. 24, "Jehovah, how manifold are thy works, by Wisdom *

* The Targum of Onkelos on Gen. i. 1, has rendered ראשית by קדמון, "The Ancient," the First, or according to Buxtorf, antiquus, prior,

hast thou made (עשית *formed*) them all." And in Proverbs viii. 22, "Jehovah possessed me, ראשית the Beginning, דרכו his Way, קדם the First, מפעליו of his works: מאן from that point of time, מעולם from hidden ages past, בסכתי I was anointed, מראש from the beginning, מקדמי from times which were before ארץ the earth."

But passing by for the present the signification contended for in the words בראשית and ברא, it is not true that "in the beginning," or first of all, Aleim brought out of a state of non-entity or into first being "the heavens and the earth." A proper understanding of the words שמים "heavens," and ארץ "earth," will set this in a right point of view. שמים is a term by which a new state of that matter or substance which fills the mundane system every where, where no other matter exists, is expressed, when it ceased to continue in that condition in which it was when brought into existence, or when it began to "dispose" or "place" in harmonious order the grosser parts of the mundane system. This matter or substance did not exist in this condition of action, or was not שמים when Jehovah produced the mundane system from a state of non-entity, because it was then, what the term חושך rendered "darkness," imports, i. e. "without motion."

ארץ is that solid shell of the terrestrial globe, covered in part with water, which is now capable of being ground, or reduced into the finest powder, or impalpable particles; * not the terraqueous globe, a turbid mass or chaos תהו "in

qui est in tempore, ante quod fuit alius, ut Noah prior fuit Davide; and not by קדמות or קדמותא, antiquitas, principium. This has been remarked by the Jewish writers on this place, as they have also observed upon the rendering of the Targum of Jerusalem on the same passage, where it is בראשיתא, "By Wisdom" Aleim formed, &c., and not, as almost all assert it to be, "In the beginning." And this sense has been held by many, well versed in the learning of the ancient Jews, to be according to the doctrine formerly maintained in their synagogues. The term חכמתא in Gen. i. 1, of the Jerusalem Targum, is but another name for the מילה, or "Word, as is evident from ver. 27, where the מילה דיי or "Word of Jehovah," is said to make man after his image.

* This is seen in the moles or molecules floating in every sunbeam.

atoms," which Jehovah brought into existence, when he produced all things from a state of non-entity.

שמים from שם, to "place, dispose," is, as has been observed, but another term, to express a new condition of that matter or substance, which in the state of דושך at the first filled all parts of the mundane system, where those grosser particles of which the orbs, &c. were afterwards formed, did not exist. דושך "stagnant, inactive," rendered "darkness," is the original state of that matter or substance which afterwards became שמים, *i. e.* "active in different ways." When it changed its first condition, or was put in motion, it became שמים, or that which disposed the grosser particles of the system into those various forms which are the objects of wonder and delight to the enlightened mind of man. The term which expressed the first condition, was changed when that condition was altered. Hence it appears that Aleim did not "in the beginning," or first of all, produce, from a state of non-entity, that matter or substance which fills the mundane system every where, where no other matter is, in the state or condition of שמים, as supposed in Gen. i. 1. He who is the living and true Aleim only put, as that Scripture declares, that matter or substance in the state of שמים, to give figure, fashion, or form to every thing in the mundane system: and this not by his own immediate act, but by the act of Him who is styled ראשית "the Beginning," the Way, the First of Jehovah's works. This appears from the connection of the first and second verses: "By [Him who was] the Beginning, Aleim formed the heavens, שמים, [or brought the matter or substance which fills, &c. into a state of varied action, part acting in one place, condition and direction, and part in another,]—ו for דושך [that matter or substance in the "state of inaction," which afterwards became שמים, or "varied action,"] *was then* upon the face of the deep."*

* In consequence of the Scriptures giving no name to that matter or substance which was at first without motion, unless it should be determined that the much disputed word אור is that name, and afterwards was

אֶרֶץ from א formative, and רץ, to "break or crumble in pieces," is another name for תָּרוֹ the terrestrial orb, or that which was originally in a state of "confused, loose, and unconnected atoms," i. e. "without form." תָּרוֹ was the first state, while the aerial matter or substance, which was in the condition of חֹשֶׁךְ "stagnant," or "inactive," rested upon the turbid chaotic mass. But when חֹשֶׁךְ became שָׁמַיִם, or that which was originally "stagnant," was put in a state of "varied action," then that which was תָּרוֹ "confusion" became order and regularity, *Κοσμος*, *Mundus*, a consolidated mass of well arranged matter, the earthy being separated from the aqueous particles, capable of being the abode of creatures that should be formed from itself, and of nourishing them with food arising from the subtle divisions of its own substance. In this instance also the name was altered when the condition was changed. Hence it likewise appears that Aleim did not "in the beginning," or first of all, produce אֶרֶץ the solid shell of "the earth," from a state of non-entity, and this receives additional confirmation from its connection with the former verse: "By [Him who was] the

put into a state of action, but merely expressing its opposite conditions by the terms חֹשֶׁךְ and שָׁמַיִם: all translators have considered these words to be appellations of things *per se*, whereas they do no more than declare the qualities or different conditions of the matter or substance. The Greeks express the primitive matter or atoms of which all things were formed by *ταῦτα*, as in the book of Wisdom, ch. xi. 17, where God is said to make "the world of matter without form," *κοσμον ἐξ ἀμορφου υλης*. But the Hebrew language has no word of similar signification, with the exception of אֶרֶץ, as above. The reason of this is worthy of our inquiry, and is deemed by some, capable of leading to a result of the highest importance. This is certain, that "Jehovah has made the שָׁמַיִם, or the matter which fills, &c. when in action, a governor, divider, and distributor. It is in an eminent degree clothed with beauty and glory, invested with vast power, possessed of vast riches, and mechanically framed to be beneficent to all that are made subject to it, and to divide and distribute all which they as subjects stand equally in want of. It may be said that this is at least a no mean emblem of Jehovah's power and grace, and not unworthy of the high honour of being selected to declare them to men and angels."

Beginning, Aleim formed the earth, for ¹ the earth was without form."*

Similar observations might be made on Gen i. 21, "And Aleim ברא formed great whales," &c. by the concretion and accretion of pre-existent matter, suspended in the waters, according to what follows, "which the waters brought forth abundantly after their kind." It would be loss of time to attempt to prove to the unlearned, that matter suited to such purposes is held in a state of suspension in the waters of the earth; and it is not necessary even to hint to them that are well informed on philosophical subjects, that earthy particles, of every species, through every gradation, from the most easily soluble salt to the hardest stone and most ponderous metal, are in a state of solution and suspension in waters, which from their extraordinary transparency and brilliancy apparently contradict the possibility of any such admixtures. In this text, therefore, it is unnecessary, from the well known nature of things, to make ברא to mean "a production from a state of non-entity." Nor will any Scripture where the word is found, and certainly not in verse 27, compared with verse 26, when the subject is duly weighed, give countenance to such an opinion.†

The Greek word κτιζω used by the New Testament writers occurs thirty-six times, either in the verbal or nominal form. In thirty-three instances it is rendered in consonance with the word "create" by our translators. In Eph. ii. 15, it is

* The view here taken of the order of the events related in Gen. i. 1, 2, is further strengthened by the tense in which the verbs are put in the original. The third and subsequent verses contain almost invariably verbs in the future time, implying that the events recorded were necessarily future to the first part of the narration; but in the second verse, a verb in the preter sense is used, היתה, which implies that the circumstances of which it speaks, were previous, and not subsequent, to those related in the first.

† Paul, in 1 Tim. ii. 13, confirms this, "For Adam was first formed πλασθη then Eve." And our translators, whether intentionally or not, by quoting Gen. i. 27, in the margin, make ברא "created" synonymous with πλασθη, "formed."

translated "make." In Heb. ix. 11, "building." In 1 Pet. ii. 13, "ordinance." These last three instances give no countenance to the other thirty-three, that "a production out of a state of non-entity" is intended by the word $\kappa\tau\iota\zeta\omega$. Nor upon an attentive examination of seventeen texts in which the LXX. have rendered ברא by $\kappa\tau\iota\zeta\omega$, is there the least reason to suppose that they attributed to this Greek verb the sense of a production into being from a state of non-entity; especially when it is noted that in other texts they made it the rendering of יסד, "to lay a foundation"; of יצר, "to form into a particular shape"; of עמד, "to continue, subsist in the same condition"; of עשה "to make out of pre-existent matter"; of קנה, "to hold, contain, possess"; and of שכן, "to inhabit."

But it will be necessary to give the sentiments of the Greeks concerning the origin of the world, to establish their meaning of the word $\kappa\tau\iota\zeta\omega$. When they speak of the Δημιουργός *Demiurge*, as "the Maker of the world," none of them intended to insinuate that he brought it out of a state of non-entity into being, but only that he constructed it of pre-existent materials, and disposed it into a regular form and order. They all agree that the matter of the world was unproduced, for there was a unanimous consent among them, that to bring any thing out of nothing was an impossibility.* They supposed two first principles, really distinct from one another, an incorporeal mind and passive matter, to have both existed without beginning: matter without form and infinite, incapable of being increased or diminished, and GOD, or an incorporeal mind, that hath and always had a power of its own, able to model and remodel it at pleasure. This could be proved at length, if occasion required; but it is mentioned

* Το γινόμενον εκ του μη οντος γινεσθαι αδυνάτον Aristotel: Phys. lib. i. 4. and Metaphys. I. cap. i. 3. One reason why the heathen maintained matter to be eternal was, that there is no word to express its production into being; a second probably was, that they knew it had not, when first produced into being, the character and form it now bears.

only to shew that there is no foundation, as far as the word *κτιζω* goes, from the authority of the earliest and best Greek philosophers, for giving it the sense of "producing being out of a state of non-entity"; and the New Testament writers must be supposed to have used it according to its common acceptation with the Greeks. Reference to a few of the texts where it occurs will furnish additional proofs of this position.

1 Cor. xi. 9. "Neither was the man created *εκτισθη* for the woman, but the woman (was created *εκτισθη*) for the man." The origin of the woman is so well known as to make it impossible to imagine, that *κτιζω* means to "produce into being out of a state of non-entity." It must mean to form from pre-existent materials. Comp. Gen i. 27—v. 2. with Matt. xix. 4—Mark x. 6.

1 Tim. iv. 3—"Forbidding to marry, *and commanding* to abstain from meats, which God hath created *εκτισεν* to be received with thanksgiving," &c. It would be considered as trifling with the patience of the serious reader of Scripture, to enter into any discussion to prove that the meats, *βρωματα*, intended by the Apostle, were not produced from non-existent matter, but formed from pre-existing materials.

1 Tim. iv. 4—"For every creature *κτισμα* of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving." The observation made on the foregoing verse is equally applicable to the present.

Mark xvi. 15—"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," *κτισει, i. e.* "every rational being." It is presumed that none will be disposed to contend, that any such being, from the Evangelist's day to the present moment, when the command is equally in force, was produced from a state of non-entity.

Col. i. 23—"If ye continue in the faith, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and was preached to every creature *κτισει* which is under heaven."

The expression here is so evidently parallel with the preceding quotation, as to require no further remark.

Rom. viii. 19—22, speaks the same language, and leads to the same results. And as this, with each preceding instance, is decisive that the radical sense of *κτίζω* is not “to bring into being out of a state of non-entity,” it will be unnecessary to urge, that it must of necessity, according to the genius of the Greek tongue, which will not admit of the simple form of any verb to have an opposite and jarring signification, preclude, in every other place, the sense of “a production into being out of a state of non-entity.” And if the English version in Eph. ii. 15, by “make,” in Heb. ix. 11 by “building,” in 1 Pet. ii. 13 by “ordinance,” be consulted, our translators must be pronounced to have entertained this opinion, or to be guilty of an evident contradiction. If the latter charge shall be founded in truth, their advocates, and their number will not be a few among the reflecting part of mankind, will plead in extenuation of the error, that they were led into it by their incompetent knowledge of the Hebrew language, and the subsequent adoption of the sentiments of many former ages; as well as of their contemporaries on this subject.

The English word “create,” as the rendering of *ברא*, is confounded with “make,” or “do.” In Exodus, xxxiv. 10, “I will do *אעשה* * marvels, such as have not been done.”—*נברא* Numb. xvi. 30, “If the Lord make *יברא* a new thing *בריאה*.” In the margin it is “create a creature.” Compare with Jer. xxxi. 22, “The Lord has created *ברא* a new thing *חדשה* in the earth.” The English word “create” as the rendering of *κτίζω* is also confounded with “make” and “build.” In Heb. ix. 11, “Christ being come by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building,” *κτισεως*. Eph. ii. 15, “Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, *even* the law of

* The LXX. in this place, in Isa. xl. 26, and xli. 20, have rendered *ברא* by *מקטננו* “to shew.”

commandments contained in ordinances, for to make *κτισμ* in himself of twain, one man."

If these texts were insufficient to prove that the word *κτιζω*, rendered "create" did not mean to produce something from a state of non-entity, the following, in which *κτιζω* is used by the Apostle, is decisive in shewing, that neither it nor its rendering "create," can have such signification. Rom. i. 25, "Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature *κτισει* more than the Creator, *τον κτισαντα*, who is blessed for ever. Amen." In this passage, the radical sense of *κτιζω* in each instance, *κτισει* and *τον κτισαντα*, as well as that of "create" in "creature" and "creator," must be the same. If "creator" *τον κτισαντα* means "Him who produces being from a state of non-entity," then "creature" *κτισει* must mean a "being produced from a state of non-entity." There can be no evasion on the subject; the terms are too plain and precise to admit of a doubt: *κτιζω* cannot have an opposite and jarring signification, especially in the same member of a sentence. But the creature which the heathen worshipped and served, was a being produced from pre-existent materials. Therefore the creator is he who produces or forms a being or beings, not out of a state of non-entity, but from something that had a positive prior existence. And to "create" cannot mean "to bring something from a state of non-entity."*

* The substance of what has been advanced, may be thus briefly expressed:—

Words are the signs or substitutes of things.

Therefore, where there is no Thing there can be no Word.

Words are the signs or substitutes of things; and it is, therefore, necessary to have a Thing, the subject of some of our senses, which is immediately brought from a state of non-entity, before a word can be formed to express it.

But there is no Thing, the object of any of our senses, which is brought immediately from a state of non-entity.

Therefore, there is no word by which we can express the production of a Thing which is brought immediately from a state of non-entity.

There are only three passages in the Old Testament in which our translators have used the word "creator": Eccles. xii. 1—Isa. xl. 28—Isa. xliii. 15. In each of these the original is בורא. When they shall be compared with the preceding remarks, they will be found to confirm what has been said. But more especially will this appear when the following scriptures are attentively considered, in connection with them, in which the word עשה, which always means "to make," or form out of pre-existent materials, is used as a parallel term with ברא. "And Aleim said, let us make נעשה man in our image, so Aleim created ברא man in his own image."—Gen i. 26—27. "Shall mortal man be more just than God אלה; shall a man be more pure than his maker עשה?"—Job. iv. 17. "But none saith, where is God אלה my maker עש."—Job xxxv. 10. "Let us kneel before Jehovah our maker עשנו."—Ps. xcv. 6. "The rich and the poor meet together, Jehovah is the maker עשה of them all."—Prov. xxii. 2. "And forgettest Jehovah thy maker עשך."—Isa. li. 13. "Thus saith Jehovah thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am Jehovah that maketh עשה all things."—Isa. xliv. 24. "Thy maker עשך is thy husband, Jehovah of hosts is his name."—Isa. liv. 5.*

"Create" is intended as a word expressive of bringing a Thing into being immediately from a state of non-entity. But it is not possible to shew a Thing that is brought into being immediately from a state of non-entity.

Therefore, the word "create" cannot possibly express the bringing a Thing into being immediately from a state of non-entity.

• The following passages usually quoted by Hebraists to prove the trine-plurality in which Jehovah has revealed himself, are rather confirmations of the pre-existence of Messiah as a man, if they be considered as paragogic instead of a sign of construction—See Deut. xxxiii. 16, "The good will of him that dwelt שכני in the bush," in which text the ך is made paragogic by our translators, in conformity with Exod. iii. 2, "The angel of Jehovah appeared," &c.

N.B. The Masorethæ have given no *keri* to this place, and this has induced some pious men to read שכני in construction שכני סנה "the

No objection has been considered so formidable to the doctrine of the pre-existence of the Saviour as a man, and so fatal even to its possibility, as the supposed rashness of its advocates, in setting up him who is a creature as the creator. This objection, however, is seen to rest on no foundation, when the terms in which it is expressed are duly appreciated; for a conclusion logically just, if drawn from false premises, must fall to the ground. Such is the case here.*

Mankind have united in imputing a meaning to the words ברא, אָזַן, and "create," which it is impossible they can have, viz. to produce being from a state of non-entity, and then have determined that a "creature" cannot be a "creator." "All Scripture is profitable for doctrine—for instruction in righteousness." But where is the doctrine of producing being from a state of non-entity to be found in Holy Writ? What word is capable of communicating the idea to mankind? And what "instruction in righteousness" would it afford the sons of men, or even the angels themselves? There must have been a point of time when Jehovah began

dwellers of *or* in the bush;" alluding to Exod. iii. 4, "Aleim called unto him out of the midst of the bush."—Eccles. xii. 1, "Remember thy creator בוראך in the days," &c. Here again no *keri* occurs, and the paralogic is acknowledged in our translation, though controverted by some who render it "thy creators." Isa. liv. 5, "Thy maker עשך is thine husband." Psal. cxlix. 2, "Let Israel rejoice in Him that made him נעשך." These texts furnish matter for similar remarks with the foregoing.

* It will probably be objected, that it is written in Isa. xlii. 5, "Thus saith God the Lord אל יתור, he that created (בורא formed) the heavens, and stretched them out; he that spread forth the earth, and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein." The reply is as easy as it is obvious: "All things are of God." And the design of his grace is to make all *men* see what *is* the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who formed אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ אֵלֶּיךָ all things by Jesus Christ. Jehovah is necessarily the cause of every good work, and the author of every blessing; but Jesus Christ is the instrument by which they are effected and conferred. The parallel passage in chap. xlv. 24, is worthy of notice. What is בורא "formed" in one scripture is עשך "made" in the other.

to act with respect to the mundane system. This is certain, and we learn that so it was (not when it was *à parte ante*, for that is impossible) from these expressive words מֵאֵז, מִקֶּדֶם, מֵרֵאשִׁית, מֵעוֹלָם. How Jehovah began to act, *quoad modum*, we know not, it is equally impossible we should; and it would be altogether useless if the information could be communicated. The act of bringing atoms, or the original particles of which matter is formed, into existence, was a one, simple and perfect act. None of our's can have any resemblance to it. Supposing it possible, it could not have been recorded for our instruction and imitation. The acts of formation might have been also instantaneous; but they were various, and in succession. The material Spirit gave motion to the surface of the waters; light succeeded next; the firmament, or expansion, followed; the dry land then appeared by the collection of the waters in the great abyss; trees and plants next adorned the face of the earth, &c. &c. All which was done not only to teach man that his works were to bear a similar character, but that Jehovah's last and most glorious work by his Spirit, viz. the making all things new, reforming or regenerating man when he had destroyed himself, would be of the same character with the first formation of the earth.

But these words, בָּרָא, κτίζω, "create," are not the only stumbling blocks which man has placed in his own way, causing himself to err at the very outset, in his search after truth. There are two others in the Greek Scriptures, ποιέω and γινώμαι, to which a similar signification has been attributed, without any foundation in the nature of the things to which they relate, or any conformity to the ideas which they are intended to convey, in other passages where they occur. The sense of producing being from a state of non-entity, has been assigned to them merely to give countenance to that opinion which has been already proved erroneous, and to give the appearance of consistency to an interpretation so confidently, but so unscripturally and unphilosophically maintained.

Ποιῶν, which in English means "to make, do, bring forth, &c. out of pre-existent materials," is the rendering of the LXX. for עָשָׂה in more than two thousand places, (See Trommius) and, as far as this vast preponderance goes, establishes it in the sense of "to make," &c. But *ποιῶν* is also the rendering, by the same Greek translators of the Scriptures, for בָּרָא in fifteen instances. They are found in Gen. i. 1, 21, 27—v. 1, 2—vi. 7: Isa. xlii. 5—xliii. 1—xlv. 7, 18—lxv. 18. "In the beginning GOD made *ἐποίησεν* the heavens and the earth," Gen. i. 1. "And God made *ἐποίησεν* great whales," Gen. i. 21. "And God made *ἐποίησεν* (וַיַּבְרֵא) man," Gen. i. 27. In the foregoing verse it runs according to the LXX. "And God said let us make *ποιήσωμεν* (נַעֲשֶׂה) man": Those translators thus stating their opinion of a coincidence in signification between עָשָׂה and בָּרָא. Of the remaining twelve there is no one but what corroborates the assertion that has been made, viz. that the LXX. considered neither בָּרָא nor עָשָׂה to have the signification of "producing being from a state of non-entity."

There are only four instances in the New Testament Scriptures which are particularly urged on this point, viz. Acts iv. 24—xiv. 15—xvii. 24. and Heb. i. 2. The first two are such as have been already virtually answered in speaking upon Gen. i. 1, and, therefore, need no further remark; the last will be noticed in another place. Acts xvii. 14, deserves a few observations here, that the error which is the subject of discussion, may become more apparent.

When these three passages in the Acts of the Apostles are adduced, to prove a "production of being from a state of non-entity," it is not urged that *ποιῶν* has such a sense in reality, but that it is only implied in each of them. The last, which is apparently the strongest, and has not yet passed in review before us, shall now be considered, to make it still more evident that there is no foundation on which such an opinion can rest: though it might have been dismissed in a summary way, because that which does no more than imply

the truth of a point in dispute, is but an inconclusive argument for its validity.

Acts xvii. 24.—“God that made the world *τον κοσμον*, and all things therein *εν αυτω*, seeing that,” &c. The English reader, especially if he is acquainted with no other language, may be excused when he gives to any word the sense which is commonly attributed to it. But such indulgence is not to be extended to them who have been taught the dead languages from an early age. It is expected from them, that, in deducing doctrines from any particular words in any language, they have made themselves masters of the origin of those words, and that they give no sense to such words which is contradictory to that origin. And if, through ignorance; from defect of investigating such original meaning, they assert an opposing or contradictory signification to be the true sense of any word on which they establish their positions, their error will not meet a similar indulgence. The terms “Heaven and Earth,” in connection with the expression “made,” as they occur in Acts iv. 24—xiv. 15, have been already determined, from an examination of Gen. i. 1, and shewn not to relate to “a production from a state of non-entity.” The term “world,” *κοσμον*, in Acts xvii. 24, is a parallel expression, having the same force, and is capable of proving, with increasing perspicuity of evidence, that the Scriptures contain no word signifying a “production of being from a state of non-entity,” but, on the contrary, where this subject is supposed to be found, it does as accurately as clearly set forth the formation of the original particles of matter which Jehovah brought into being, from a state of non-entity into those various shapes, in things animate and inanimate, which prove his wisdom and power, and excite our wonder, praise and adoration. The authority of the Greek philosophers may be considered as decisive on this point. Aristotle defines *Κοσμος* to be “a system composed of the heaven, and the earth, and of all things contained in them.” He adds, “*Κοσμος* is otherwise a name given to the order and beautiful arrangement of

the universe," lib. j. de Mundo. Plutarch says "Pythagoras was the first who gave the name of *Κοσμος* to the system of the universe, from the order so conspicuous in it." De placit. Philos. lib. ij. cap j.* Peter brings more than a collateral evidence when he says, "Whose adorning *κοσμος* let it not be," &c. 1 Ch. iii. 3. *Κοσμος*, then, cannot mean the "world," or "universe," when brought into existence from a state of non-entity, in loose, confused, unconnected atoms, without form or order; but, on the contrary, when it was brought into order, and exhibited that regularity and beautiful arrangement of all its parts, which induced the heathen, who knew not Him by whose power it was thus formed, to worship the creature instead of the creator, or that which was so formed instead of Him who had formed it.

To return, then, to the word *ποιεω*, with which these observations are immediately connected, it is placed beyond a doubt, that in Acts xvii. 24. it cannot mean "to bring into being from a state of non-entity."—"God that made *ὁ ποιήσας* the world *τον κοσμον*, and all things therein *εν αυτω*," &c. was never intended by the apostle to convey to mankind the idea that God, at that period of which he was speaking, brought the universe or world *τον κοσμον* into existence from a state of non-entity. The term itself, according to the usage of the Greek philosophers, to whom recourse must be had to understand its meaning, proves the contrary. God made this beautiful arrangement which we behold in the heavens and in the earth. He brought them, by his son Jesus, the Christ, John i. 2.—Eph. iii. 9.—Col. i. 16, into their present form and order, where all is harmony. How different this condition from that in which the world was when his almighty power

* The Latin authors confirm this view, which is founded on true philosophy, and was adopted by the Greeks, from the scriptures, through some tradition. Cicero says, "This system, distinguished by the variety that strikes every beholder, which the Greeks so appositely term *κοσμος*, we call *Mundus lucens*." In *Timæo* § 10, Pliny remarks, "What the Greeks called *κοσμος*, by a name denoting ornament, we, from its perfect and finished elegance, denominate *Mundus*." Nat. Hist. lib. i. c. 4.

brought it first into existence in its chaotic state! But God not only "made" or "formed" "the world" *κοσμος*, but "all things therein," *εν αυτω*. When the universe, or this mundane system, was first produced, there were only loose, unconnected atoms. Confusion pervaded the whole. When the heavens had their present character, and the earth its present form, then the herbs and trees, the orbs that float, as well as those that are fixed in the vast expanse, the fowls, fishes, beasts, reptiles, and, lastly, man, were formed; and each took its assigned place in the well-ordered frame of the material heaven and earth.

The world, when brought into existence, was disorder and confusion: but *κοσμος* was a name given to the world on account of the beautiful and perfect arrangement of all its parts: therefore, *κοσμος* cannot mean the world when first brought into existence.

In this manner, after bringing into being the materials of which all things consist, by one simple act of his will, Jehovah in six days caused chaos to settle into order, regularity, and beauty, through a variety of mutual movements in the several parts of matter: by which, those that were of different and incongruous qualities separated from each other, and those that were of the same essence and form coalesced together. This is what Scripture intends, when it is said, "God made or formed the world," or "God made or formed the heavens and the earth." And in thus giving a right sense to the language of holy writ, no danger is incurred, as some have supposed, of derogating from his immutability or omnipotence, in attributing to Him successive acts of producing beings into existence from a state of non-entity. By a right understanding of the word *ποιειν*, we are presented with a succession of order only in formation, and this formation is said to be effected in succession of time, not to accommodate the works of Jehovah to the apprehensions of uninformed minds, by giving a more intelligible account of them, but for the wise and beneficent purposes which have been already mentioned.

A few observations on the word *γινωμαι*, understood in some particular texts like *ποιεω*, "to produce being out of a state of non-entity," with a design to support the erroneous views drawn from a sense given to *אזל* and *ברא*, as false in the nature of things as they are contrary to true philosophy and the oracles of truth, will close this part of the subject.

As great deference is paid by many to the authority of the LXX. to satisfy them who think favourably of their translation, it will be proper to state their opinion of the meaning of this disputed word *Γινωμαι*. "To be, or become, be made, or formed," is the common rendering of the Greek version for the following Hebrew words: *בכר* "to precede in birth," *היה* "to be," *חזה* "to fasten upon," *ילד* "to procreate," *יצא* "to go out," *כן* "to establish," *לקח* "to take," *מדד* "to measure," *נהג* "to lead," *עשה*, *ונו* "to make, form," &c. none of which can be supposed to have any affinity to the sense so much contended for by very many, viz. to "produce being from a state of non-entity." But there are also three passages where *ברא* is translated by *γινωμαι*, viz. Gen. ii. 4. Exod. xxxiv. 10. Isa. xlviii. 7. These do not require any comment, being such as no novice in the Hebrew tongue, however anxious to establish a favourite hypothesis, can misinterpret. Passing them by, therefore, our attention shall be directed to a higher authority, no less than the inspired penman of the New Testament. Here two texts are especially adduced to prove that the disputed sense of "producing being from a state of non-entity" is made most apparent in the use of *γινωμαι*, viz. John i. 3—10. They run thus: "All things were made *εγενετο* by him, and without him was not any thing made *εγενετο* that was made *γεγονεν*." "He was in the world *κοσμος*, and the world *κοσμος* was made *εγενετο* by him." To pass by verse 3 for the present, verse 10 shall be considered in respect to the leading word *κοσμος*, of which it is said, by not a few, that it was made or produced from a state of non-entity by Him who is called *ὁ Λογος* "The Word." The proper signification of *κοσμος* has been ascer-

tained, on principles which the most sceptical will find it no easy matter to prove erroneous. Claiming this as the right sense, the *Λογος* cannot be said to bring it from a state of non-entity, because, when the universe was brought from a state of non-entity, it was without form—*chaos*—*καὶ* “loose, unconnected atoms;” it became (*εγενετο*) *κοσμος* when he “formed,” or “made,” or brought it into its present state of order, regularity, and beauty. The *Λογος* was not in, or did not manifest himself to, the world in its chaotic state. At that time there was no creature to behold his glory, to express a consciousness of his goodness, or to deny his power and to reject his grace. He was not manifested till chaos was succeeded by that state of beautiful arrangement so expressively termed *κοσμος*. He was then in the world *κοσμος*, and the world *κοσμος* so different in respect to the order, regularity and beauty of its constituent atomic parts, became *εγενετο* such not by chance, not by any independent internal movement of those atoms among themselves, by which confusion was reduced to order, but by the wisdom and power of the *Λογος*. When proper attention is paid to the meaning of the word *κοσμος*, which, though not unknown to the classical reader, has been generally overlooked, the usual signification, so arbitrarily and so unwarrantably given to *εγενετο*, and that for the purpose of confirming a sense as arbitrarily and unwarrantably attributed to other words (*κτιζω* and *πριω*) in the Greek Scriptures, will be found wholly unjustifiable. Whereas by giving to *γινωμαι* the sense which it bears in many other places in the New Testament, viz. “to be,” “to become,” “to be made or formed,” (See Matt. iv. 3. John. i. 12—ii. 9. Acts xxvi. 28) all discordance is done away. The New Testament contains nothing contrary to the Old, nor in opposition to itself. Jehovah did, and He alone could, produce being from a state of non-entity. But a being so produced could, if it pleased Jehovah, give form to materials already brought into existence. All power being given in heaven and in earth, unto such a being, he could arrange the several

parts of which they consist, in that harmonious order, from which so many benefits have resulted to man from generation to generation.

The 3rd verse will require but few observations, after what has been said. "All things were formed *εγενετο* by him (the *Λογος*), and without him was not any thing formed *εγενετο* that was formed *γεγονεν*." This obvious and necessary sense of formation, shews how little occasion there is to have recourse to the bold assertion which has been hazarded by some pious characters, who have considered the *Logos* to be here spoken of as a man, viz. that Jehovah could give to a creature power to produce being from non-entity. Their design was to extricate themselves from the difficulty in which they were involved, by the generally received signification of *γινωμαι*; whereas, the natural and necessary sense of the word leads to an act which is neither contrary to the character, nor unsuited to the powers of the creature to whom the act is attributed. The idea of formation not only reconciles the mind to the *Logos* becoming the instrument of giving fashion, shape or figure to all things, as an act not inconsistent with his creature-character, but also enables the Bible student to see the propriety and consistency of interpreting the following texts in the same way. "Unto me is this grace given, that I should preach the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who formed *τῷ κτισαντι* all things by Jesus Christ."—Eph. iii. 9. "For by Him [who is called in some preceding verses "Christ," "Jesus Christ," "God's dear Son": and of whom it is said, "In whom we have redemption through his blood—who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature,"] were all things formed *εκτισθη* that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible; all things were formed *εκτισται* by him and for him."—Col. i. 16.*

*.It ought to be observed, that the words "by Jesus Christ," in *Eph. iii. 9*, are not found in the Alexandrian or Vatican manuscript, and

The sense of "forming" out of pre-existent materials, and not "producing being from a state of non-entity," belonging to *κτιζω*, *ποιεω* and *γινωμαι*, according to the nature of things, as well as from the necessity of the language, which will admit of no verb in the simple form conveying a contrary and opposite signification, precludes altogether the necessity of resorting to any subterfuge, evasion, or accommodation. The plain, obvious, and consistent sense of the Greek original, puts an end at once to all doubt, as it does to the necessity of any further discussion.

The triumphs which these inconsistencies and oppositions to plain and obvious scriptural truths afford to the gainsayer, are subjects of deep regret to the well-grounded Christian, who witnesses the rapid increase of infidelity. Daily experience confirms him in the opinion, that if infidelity has not originated from such indiscretions, to give them no worse name, but has arisen from other causes, it has been so confirmed by them, as to render unavailing every argument which the laborious and consistent interpreter of Holy Writ can bring from the word of God. But let this key to the solution of difficulties, considered as insurmountable, be applied to the subject under consideration; or, in other words, let the expressions usually interpreted to mean a "production of being from a state of non-entity," be duly weighed, though conviction may not generally follow, yet a stumbling-block of no small magnitude to the reception of the fundamental doctrines

are omitted in some of the versions. Griesbach, however, does not consider them as altogether without authority, and has, therefore, given them a place in his margin. It is most probable that the omission of the words *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ* "by Jesus Christ," which are found in very few versions, and in still fewer manuscripts, proceeded from the scruples which would occur of making Jesus Christ an instrument of doing what Jehovah alone can effect, viz. producing being out of a state of non-entity. But in Col. i. 16, all manuscripts and versions agree in attributing whatever is intended by the word *κτιζω* to Jesus Christ, as the creature of Jehovah. A tacit confession this, if the paucity of authorities were not sufficient to determine the point, that the words in Eph. iii. 9, were not an interpolation.

of the Pre-existence of the Saviour as a Man, will be removed to many. It would appear strange, if the power of prejudice were not well known, that any English reader should ever have given to the word "made" the meaning of "bringing being from a state of non-entity": but may not a stronger epithet be justly applied, if the student, who is capable of appreciating the preceding arguments founded on the dead languages, shall determine, that the act affirmed to be done when *κτίω*, *ποιέω*, or *γίνομαι* are used in the New Testament, and *ברא* in the Old, is necessarily the immediate act of Jehovah? It is an undoubted truth, that "All things are of God": but as he hath reconciled us to himself by (the Man) Jesus Christ, so he may have formed all things for his own glory by the same Man Jesus Christ. The Divine Essence is no more necessary to be the immediate agent in one case than in the other.

The extensive powers with which MESSIAH was endowed in his embodied state, as the *מלאך יהוה* "Angel of Jehovah," are not incompatible with his human character before incarnation, any more than the equally extensive powers which he now possesses in his embodied glorified state, either do, or are supposed by any to extinguish the humanity which is now ascended where it was before it came down from heaven.

CHAPTER II.

HOWEVER successful the preceding remarks may be found in removing any prejudice that has been instilled by early education, or occasioned by intercourse with them that oppose the doctrine of the Pre-existence of the Saviour Jesus Christ as a Man, they are but a part of the first principles that are necessary to be established, before the way can be prepared for the Bible student to receive this doctrine consistently and cordially. An object may be seen by any one distinctly, in all its parts and proportions, and he may describe it to others with great accuracy and perspicuity; yet if it be an object which is contrary to all the former experience of those to whom he would make it known; before he can expect them to admit that it exists, and agrees perfectly with the description given, he ought not only to be assured that they have the same powers of perception and judgment with himself, but he should place them in the same point of view in which he stands. Any material, perhaps the least, deviation from this point, may, from the varying of light and shade, &c. prove an insurmountable bar to a conviction that the object exists, or is as it is represented.

The writer has no reason to suppose that the sentiments which his pen traces, are the production of his own imagination. The nature of things, as well as the testimony of Holy Writ, to say nothing of the concurrence of many wise and good men, satisfy him that they are not the reveries of a dis-tempered mind. He is convinced, moreover, that not only a similar, but a much superior capacity of duly appreciating

the doctrine in question, will be found among them who may be disposed to peruse these pages. It will be proper, therefore, to place them in the same point of view in which he himself stands. This can be done in no other way, than by detailing what he has learned from the oracles of truth on this subject, in the best manner he is able. And, while he is doing this, his chief anxiety will be, lest the cause of Jehovah's everlasting truth, with respect to its diffusion among men, should suffer, as far as the present effort is concerned, through his imperfect knowledge of it, or through his inaccuracy in expressing what he has been taught.

Before it can be determined that the Man, the Lord Jesus Christ, did exist before all things, it will be necessary to shew what is, and what is not, the Humanity. On no point whatever, that has been or is still disputed in the Christian world, does there appear a greater obscurity than on this subject. It is usual when speaking upon it, to employ the word "Nature" in conjunction with the epithet "Human." Nature, from the Latin *natura*, which is from *nascor*, "to be born," leads us to the moment when the offspring is first separated from its mother: and as we are then first acquainted with it in the form or character in which it afterwards daily presents itself to us, we are induced to pronounce that that must be its original and only character, and that antecedently to this conception and birth in the flesh, there was no other existence whatever. To be born, *nascor*, whence *natura* and "nature," that peculiar outward form or character with which man comes into this world, is considered as constituting his first and essential form and character; and that it is necessary to his very being as man. Naturalists, however, have no hesitation in coming to a contrary decision on the subject, with regard to individuals in the animal and vegetable worlds. And the multiplication or deficiency of the parts of the form of man, or even the absence of rationality, has in no instance been deemed sufficient to induce a supposition, that the distinguishing characteristic of humanity were wanting. What

is it then that constitutes the manhood of every individual of the human race, and consequently of the Lord Jesus Christ himself? Is the external form, which our eyes behold, and our hands handle, a necessary or essential part? If it be, the Pre-existence of the Saviour, the Man Jesus Christ, before the world began, must be a chimera, a groundless imagination: and all that has been affirmed on this subject deserves no more attention, from the diligent searcher into the truths of revelation, than the frantic effusions of a lunatic. But on a point so important, and as it is maintained by them who uphold this doctrine, so fundamental, it is not what this or that man advances, but what Scripture saith. To this law and testimony, therefore, recourse must be had. If Holy Writ contain nothing on this subject, or is not so explicit that "he may run who readeth it," it ought to be dismissed as an idle speculation, and they who have employed their time and their talents on such discussions, should be pronounced to have done something much worse than trifling with the gifts which heaven, in its bounty, has bestowed upon them.

Before any texts are advanced, as speaking of what the Humanity is, or is not, it will be proper to consider the real signification of some words, which forms a prominent part of those texts. In the Hebrew language there are three words that express the creature man, אִישׁ, אָדָם, אָנוּשׁ.

אִישׁ is usually derived from יָשָׁה, "to be, subsist," with the prefixed א, denoting simply that he man "is," or has a "subsistence, without any further specification of what or how he is or subsists. But by some, אִישׁ is supposed to be derived from אָשׁ, "to be active, vigorous," from the peculiar vigour and activity of man both in body and mind, above all other creatures.

אָדָם is thought by some to be derived from אָדָמָה, "the ground or vegetable mould" from which man was formed. "And Jehovah Aleim formed the man הָאָדָם out of the dust of the ground הָאָדָמָה," Gen. ii. 7. Others are of opinion that

אדם should be derived from דמה, "to form a likeness," because it is said that Aleim formed man אדם in ב "after, according to."—see Numb. xiv. 34] the likeness דמות of Aleim." Gen. v. 1. The first of these opinions determines of what or how the creature named "man" is or subsists, as having a place among the six days' work. A visible and tangible substance is attributed to him, such as is generally known by the term "body." And when considered in connection with the denunciation, "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," Gen. iii. 19, carries some weight with it, though from other Scriptures it does not appear to be the proper derivation. The second opinion seems better adapted to make Scripture harmonize with itself, at the same time that it carries the mind back to an antecedent state of man's creatureship before that of the body, and to the important truth on which the scheme of redemption is founded. Aleim formed man אדם "after, or according to the likeness בדמות of Aleim."—Gen. v. 1. A likeness is not the Thing or Being itself. Simile non est Idem. The likeness of Aleim must be some thing, or being distinct from Aleim. (Compare Col. i. 13—15, where we see who this holy thing or being was.) To this the creature termed אדם "man" was conformed; or the frame, constituted of the "dust of the ground," which afterwards, from a breach of the command of Jehovah Aleim, was to return to the ground out of which it had been taken, was conformed to this Being which had been set up to be the likeness and image of Jehovah Aleim. "And Aleim said, Let us make man according to our image, [צלם a specific bodily figure, see 1 Cor. xi. 7.] after our likeness.—So Aleim formed the man את האדם according to his own image, according to the image of Aleim formed he him: male and female formed he them." Gen. i. 26, 27. Of course this image or specific bodily figure, the Prototype of Adam, must have had an actual existence: and, according to the expressed declaration of the generality of

the Jewish and Christian fathers, this glorious Pre-existent Creature really appeared in that form in the first dispensations of the world. And if an image, or what is like another, he could not be the same as that other.

An Image is not the same with that which it represents :
But

Jesus Christ is the Image of God, or Jehovah Aleim :
Therefore

Jesus Christ is not the same with God, or Jehovah Aleim, whom he represents.

אָנש is a third term by which the creature "man" is expressed. It is derived from the root אָנש, "to be infirm, ill, in body or mind," and speaks nothing of his essence, or of his outward form, i. e. of the production of his outward form, or of his internal original character, but of the state or condition into which he is fallen, in both the outward and inward man by sin.

There are other terms by which the "outward man" is expressed. These are declarative of its character while in union with the "inward man," or when separated from it, as they are also indicative of its present peculiar character of distinct being, and future state or destination.

There are likewise two terms by which man is expressed, viz. נָכַר and נָכַר; but as they are names indicative chiefly of sex, they do not belong to the genus, and are therefore omitted in this place.

נֶכֶד and נֶכֶד, "a body," from נָכַד "to collect into a mass."

נֶכֶד "the body,"—a solid substance which resists or opposes itself when "smitten," or "stricken"; from נָכַד, "to strike, smite," in opposition to the inward man, which is not subject to outward force or violence.

מָת "a dead body,"—from מָת "to fail or faint, so as to produce a cessation of all the energies and functions by which animal life is continued."

נָבֵל "a dead carcase falling to decay,"—from נָבֵל "to

fall down, off, or away." A necessary consequence of the disunion of the inward from the outward man.

פָּנָה "an inactive or dead body, a carcase,"—from פָּנָה, to "lose one's activity." The state in which the body, or outward man, is immediately after the inward man is separated from it.

שָׂרָא "flesh,"—from שָׂאָר "to remain, be left." For that "remains" when the inward man is separated from it by death.

As a further illustration of this subject, two Chaldee words deserve insertion in this place.

גָּשָׁם "a body, a tangible substance,"—from גָּשָׁם "to be heavy, lie heavy upon." This property is the very opposite of spirit.

נָרַךְ "a body," or "sheath,"—from נָרַךְ "to remove." It is indicative of the necessity of the removal, or separation of the outward man, to enable the inward to exert its powers, &c.

It will be proper also to insert here, some terms used by the New Testament writers to express the "outward man": and the reader will excuse the anticipation of a few intermixed human authorities, which, though not intended to carry any weight for deciding the force of the apostolical language, will, perhaps, appear more forcible than if they had been deferred to their proper place, in a subsequent page.

Οἰκία "the human body," or "the habitation" of the "inward man" when on earth. It is designated by the epithet ἐπιγῆιος, "made of earth." There appears, however, to be another οἰκία, or "habitation" for the inward man, in which it is to dwell in heaven. This is designated by the epithet ἀχειροποίητος, "not made with hands."

Σὰρξ "the flesh," or "the human body." It appears to be derived from the Hebrew שָׂאָר, "to remain": because it "remains" the object of our senses after all its functions have ceased, by the separation of the inward man from it.

Σκευος "the body," or "earthen vessel," in which the inward man is contained. The Latin classics call the human body "Vas," being the receptacle of the anima and animus of man.*

Σκηνος "the human body," or "tabernacle," from שכן, "to dwell, inhabit." Grotius, *De Veritate Relig. Christianæ*, lib. j. § 16, note 6, has this singular quotation from Eurysus, the Pythagorean: "The tabernacle, [viz. of man] is like those of other animals, as being of the same matter. It was made, however, by a most excellent architect, who framed it after the pattern of himself."

Σκηνομα "the human body," or "tabernacle," in which the inward man dwells, from σκηνη, "a tent," which is from the Hebrew שכן, "to dwell, inhabit."

σωμα "the animal body," as some suppose from σωζω, "to preserve," or from σημα, "a sepulchre," in which the inward man is entombed on earth: or from םש, "to place," being "the place" or residence of the inward man.

After such evidence from the Old and New Testament, it would be as absurd as unavailing, to bring forward the opinions of either ancients or moderns, to prove the doctrine in question. The following sentiments are collected merely for the purpose of shewing, that certain vestiges of the subject

* By neither anima nor animus did they understand what was termed by Paul the "inward man," or what in modern times is intended by "the soul." The language of the Romans was, *Animâ vivimus, Animo sapimus*; or *Anima est vitæ, Animus consilii*. Anima was with them the Sensitive Principle; animus the Rational Faculty in man. Both of which was in and of the Outward Man. Neither Romans nor Greeks had a word to express the Inward Man. They knew nothing of that which was to survive the body. The life and immortality of that was brought to light by Jesus Christ. Even the Hebrew tongue has no word expressive of what it is, only of the state or condition in which it is in every individual, while it exists in the body. "Behold, thou desireth truth in the inward parts, (שׂוּרִית, the animal frame or outward man) and in the hidden (סֶתֶם, the spiritual or inward man, which is concealed in the outward) thou shalt make me to know wisdom."—Ps. li. 6.

in dispute, though incorrect, were retained, so much nearer the period when it may be supposed there were some traditional remains of old truths floating in the memory of mankind. As no base coin was ever in existence, without a corresponding original, which it was intended to represent, so it may be well argued, that these imperfect representations of a truth, asserted to have been once well understood, would have had no being, unless there had been a prototype, of which they were made the representatives more or less accurately.

The Jews say, "Every man has two houses, the house of the body, and the house of the soul. The one is the outward, the other the inward house."—Sepher Caphtor. fol. 38, 2. They speak also of *בית קדושא*, "the holy house in the world to come."—Zohar in Exod. fol. 34, 3—35, 3. Again, "When a man's time is come to go out of this world, he does not depart until the angel of death has stripped him of the clothing of this body; and when the soul is stripped of the body by the angel of death, it goes, and is clothed with that other body which is in Paradise. The holy blessed God deals well with men, for he does not strip them of their clothes until he has provided for them other clothes, more precious and better than these."—Zohar in Exod. fol. 62, 1, 2. "The Jews do not all agree whether man will rise again with the same clothing he had at death. Some assert that he will be as Adam was in Paradise: others, that he will have a body like that of the angels."—Voisin Observat. in Raym. Martin. pug. fid. p. 618.

"Moses," says Philo, "was *ἄσωματος* without the body, during his stay of forty days and forty nights in the mount."—De Somniis, p. 570.

"We are," observed Plato, "a spiritual principle, an immortal living being, confined in a mortal munition."—*Ἀξιοχο οἷτ. Ἄεσχιν. Σοκρατ. Dial. III. 5.*

The body is styled by Longinus, *ἀνθρώπινον σκηνοε*, "the tabernacle of man."—De Sublim. § xxxii.

Death is described by "letting loose the inner from the outer man," the spiritual inhabitant from the earthly house of this tabernacle. Elsner cites from Porphyry, *απολυειν τὸ σωματος*, "to dismiss from the body:" and from Ælian, *απολυειν ἐκ τῶν τοῦ σωματος δεσμῶν*, "to let loose from the bonds of the body."

With this preparation, the following texts will probably not carry the appearance, which they might otherwise have done, of being wrested to support a system. For in thus shewing what it is that constitutes the humanity of every individual of the human race, in contradistinction to that which is only its dwelling place for a season,* the humanity of the

* The process of mutation in the body is little known to the world at large, and not much attended to by them who are acquainted with it. When our bodies have attained their full growth, we continue to partake of food at the usual times, not to add to their bulk or height, but to repair the loss which is perpetually taking place in the system. The chyle is conveyed to the mass of blood for that purpose, and assists in renewing those parts which have suffered by exertion, age, or injury. The old particles, which are no longer adapted to their several original purposes, are taken up by the absorbent vessels, and the new ones which succeed in their place, are deposited by the secerning extremities of the arteries. By this process which is going on in every part of the human frame, and is termed mutation of the body, the whole of the machine undergoes a complete change in the space of about six years: or in other words, not a particle remains which belonged to it six years before. As far then as Identity is concerned, with respect to the body, which is so much and necessarily the object of our care, no individual identity can go farther back than six years. This fact, that the human system undergoes a total mutation, within such a space of time, is completely subversive of the doctrine of the resurrection of the same body, as deciding the identity of each individual for the purpose of reward or punishment. (See Note at p. 40.) There will however be a resurrection, and there is a body belonging to each individual which will be raised. "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." "There are celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial": and "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things *done in his* [terrestrial] body, according to that he hath done, whether *it be* good or bad." But it will be asked, was not our Lord's body, which died on the cross, and was buried, the same with that which rose again on the third day, which is now in heaven,

Lord's Anointed will be less liable to be misunderstood, and another stumbling block to the reception of the doctrine of his Pre-existence as a man, will be removed.

Job x. 11—"Thou hast clothed ME with skin and flesh: thou hast fenced ME with bones and sinews."—The distinction here made between the inward and the outward man, is obvious. Hence death, or the separation of the one from the other, is called an "unclothing." We that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened, not that we would be unclothed," &c. &c.

Job xv. 7—"Wast thou brought forth תולך before Adam, or wast thou produced חוללת before the hills, hast thou heard the secret of God, and dost thou restrain wisdom thyself?"—Here is surely more than an obscure intimation that there was One brought forth before Adam, that there was One produced before the hills, that there was One who had

and will be seen again on earth? And if the Head of the Church is re-invested with the same natural frame which died, will not every member of it have the like privilege? Let the reason of the resumption of this body by the Saviour be rightly considered, and the ground of each member of his church being raised again in the same manner, will not appear so tenable. "Is not this the carpenter's son?" "He hath no form nor comeliness that we should desire him": "We will not have this man to reign over us,"—was and is still the language of them who despise and reject him. It is to confound the wisdom of the wise, to confound the things that are mighty, that they may be ashamed and confounded for their own ways, that they shall see Jesus in the body of his flesh, which was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned in that body with glory and honour: it is that the adversary, no longer able to gainsay, may confess, that the same Jesus, who was in derision clothed in purple, is Lord to the glory of God the Father. But when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power, and each shall receive according to the deeds done in the body, then will he put off the earthly house of this tabernacle, and being clothed upon with his house which is from heaven, he shall be proclaimed King of kings and Lord of lords—the Servant of Jehovah, whom he upholds, his Elect, in whom his soul delights, his beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased, who magnified his law on the cross, and made it honourable in his Resurrection, and to whom it is granted to make his church partaker of that glory, which he had with the Father before the world began.

heard the secret of God, and did restrain wisdom to himself? These questions when interpreted in their most simple meaning, and in a way consistent with other Scriptures, refer clearly to the Pre-existent Messiah. The literal version of the original is as follows:—

“What! the One prior to Adam wast thou brought forth?”

There was a Man in existence, and in the full development of all the powers and excellencies which constitute manhood, prior to Adam. Jesus Christ was “the first-born of every creature,”—He was “the beginning of the creation of God.” That objection is as ill timed as it is inconclusive, which urges the absurdity or impossibility of the existence of the spiritual or inward man, before the corporeal or outward man; since it is allowed on all hands, that the spiritual or inward man does exist after its separation from the earthly tabernacle. What continues in being after a disunion, may have had an existence before that union took place. It should be remembered, that men as they are seen by man, and become the objects of mutual observation, are only “the fathers of our flesh”; and that “God is the Father of spirits.” Jesus was “set up ere the earth was.” “Jehovah possessed me, the Beginning, his Way, the First of his works.”

“Before the hills wast thou produced?”

There was One produced before the hills: even Jesus Christ, of whom it is said, in the same words with Job, לפני נבעות חוללת, “Before the hills I was produced into being.”—Prov. viii. 25.

“Has thou been a perpetual hearer תשמע in the secret council of God?”

There is One who answers this description. Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son: which was in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. He “stood in the council of Jehovah, and perceived and heard his word: he marked his word, and heard it.” He hath “known the mind of the Lord, and hath been his counsellor.” “The counsel of peace was between them both.” For this is his name, “Wonderful, Counsellor.”

"And dost thou restrain wisdom to thyself?"

There is One man to whom this character is peculiarly appropriate. "In Him," the Christ of God, "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." His name is "Wisdom." "He hath builded his house. He crieth upon the highest places of the city. Whoso is foolish פְּתִי let him turn in hither: to him whose heart is turned aside, דָּסֵר לֵב, she saith to him, Come."

"Luke xxiii. 43—" And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

The state of the Saviour at the moment in which these words were uttered, as also that of the thief to whom they were addressed, is evident. The body of each was fixed to a cross. In each body was an animal life. Besides this there was a spiritual subsistence incapable of destruction when the bodily frame ceased to be animated with the breath, which is the life thereof. This state or condition was to be of short duration to the persons of whom the Evangelist speaks. They were both soon to leave the earth, and to be in Paradise. But it is well known that the body of neither was taken from the earth. And it is equally notorious, that when the spirit or breath with which their bodies had been animated, was gone forth, it mixed with that surrounding atmosphere by which it had been supported, and into which it was during life with repeated alternations returned. What then was it that went to Paradise? or in what did the Humanity consist, that was found there, according to the promise of him who could not lie? "To-day shalt THOU be with ME in Paradise." It is evident that it could be only the soul, or inward man. The Saviour, indeed, returned to his body which he had laid down, and resumed the spirit which had animated it, because he was an High Priest, who was to continue as such, till that period should arrive, when his intercessorial office should end, by the number of the elect being accomplished. The thief is absent from the body, and present with his still Incarnate Lord, at whose right hand *there are pleasures for evermore.*

2 Cor. iv. 16—"For which cause we faint not, but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day."

The outward man, viz. the body, with its animal appetites and affections, is common to man with the irrational part of creation. "The inward man," or spiritual part, is peculiar to him alone of all terrestrial beings. While the former is perishing daily, with every thing around it, the latter is daily renewed in as many as are heirs of the kingdom of God: *i. e.* the inward man is brought into new exercise, under the power of the Holy Spirit, day by day. A circumstance frequently very manifest in the children of God, when their outward man is fast approaching to its dissolution.

2 Cor. v. 1, 2.—"We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens: for in this we groan, desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven."

The leading points in this text are, that man has a building liable to dissolution, in which he dwells for a season, a house, a tabernacle: and besides this house made of earth, to sojourn in on earth all the days of his appointed time, he has another house, not made with hands, designed for him to dwell in in heaven. The apostle speaks of different habitations in which the same inhabitant is manifested in different places, and at different periods of his existence.

2 Cor. xii. 2—4.—"I knew a man in Christ, whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth. Such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth. How that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard," &c.

The distinction of that in which the humanity consists, from the body in which it dwells, is here as self evident, as it is from the "earthly house of this tabernacle" of the preceding quotation. The tenant and tenement vary from each other in

character as much as any two things in nature can well be conceived to differ. How then is it that they are so perpetually confounded?

Phil. i. 22—24.—“For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labour : yet what I shall choose I wot not, for I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better. Nevertheless, to abide in the flesh is more needful for you.”

The same distinction is here also most obvious, between the humanity and its dwelling place, with the peculiar characteristic of the former, in contradistinction to that of the latter, when it ceases to be in union with it. That lives, having desires and affections, but departs hence. This dies, unable to subsist when alone, and unnecessary to the subsistence of its spiritual partner, and remains, though for a short time only, in its organized form, to manifest that it once had an inhabitant, and then returns unto the ground out of which it was taken, to become flesh to some living creature, perhaps to man,* in repeated succession, and again and again to return to dust. In this point of view something more than impropriety suggests itself to the reflecting mind, when an attempt is made to confound the tabernacle with its present or former possessor.†

* As this is incontrovertibly the case with the cannibal tribes of Australasia, &c. how can the same outward body return to the same individual at the resurrection? Whatever the eater receives at the time of the horrid banquet, and retains till his death, so much must be deficient in him that was eaten, when he shall come forth.

† The very general belief in the resurrection of the body, or outward man, seems to be grounded rather on a commonly received notion, handed down for many generations, than on any particular portions of Scripture, or the deductions which are to be made from its contents, when consistently interpreted. In Mark ix., when Jesus “charged Peter, James, and John, that they should tell no man what things they had seen (on the mount) till the Son of Man were risen from the dead,” “they questioned one with another what the rising from the dead should mean.” When he “taught his disciples that after he was killed, he should rise

Heb. ii. 14.—“Forasmuch then as the children are part-takers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same: that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil.”

the third day, they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask him.” If the resurrection of the body or outward man had been a commonly received notion, this declaration of their Lord would not have excited any surprise in their minds. The resurrection of any of the sons of men, *i. e.* of any terrestrial bodies after death, does not appear to have formed an article in the creed of men in those days. For this reason the women who entered the sepulchre, and were told that Jesus was risen, “went out quickly and fled from the sepulchre, for they trembled and were amazed.” And when they had “told these things unto the apostles, their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed not.” “After that,” when “Jesus appeared unto two of them, as they walked and went into the country,” though they acknowledged that they had heard “that he was alive,” they could not believe the glad tidings, exclaiming, that they “had trusted that it had been he which should redeem Israel,” but knowing that “the chief priests and rulers had delivered him to be condemned to death, and had crucified him,” all hope of salvation by him was at an end. The rising of the body, or outward man, from the dead, to be the object of their affection and hope, was so strange a thing to them, that nothing but a personal view of the risen Redeemer could overcome their slowness “of heart to believe all that the prophets had spoken” concerning him. So deeply rooted also was the antipathy to receive any intelligence which was contrary to the experience, as well as the creed, of that and every past age,* that Thomas, after “the other disciples said unto him, We have seen the Lord, said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.” The language in Mark xii. confirms this. To the Sadducees, who asked, “In the resurrection therefore, when they (*viz.* the seven brethren, and the woman whom each took as a wife) shall rise, whose wife shall she be? Jesus answering, said unto them, When they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels which are in heaven.” The Sadducees not only rejected, in common with all others, (Acts xvii. 32.—xxvi. 3, 8,

* N.B. The instances recorded in 2 Kings iv. 34, 35.—xiii. 21, as well as those that are found under the New Testament dispensation, like all other miracles wrought on the bodies of men, were only types of the spiritual resurrection from a death of sin to a life of righteousness, on the souls of men, by the power of God, in the person of the Word, his Son Jesus Christ. They could not be the first fruits of the general harvest of the resurrection of earthly bodies to an endless life, because they all returned to that state of death out of which they had been taken.

Here we see Jesus, by whom, as the efficient cause, for "God created all things by Jesus Christ," are all things, taking part with his brethren of flesh and blood. And what is flesh with the blood, which while in circulation is the life

22, 23,) the resurrection of the body, or outward man, but denied what was held by all others, not excepting the pharisees, that there was any resurrection of angel or spirit, *i. e.* of the soul, or inward man. The words of our Lord, therefore, run thus, "When they [*i. e.* their angels or spirits which are now "in heaven always beholding the face of my Father which is in heaven," Matt. xviii. 20.] shall rise [*sarxos* "stand up again," "in their lot at the end of the days," Dan. xii. 13.] from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; [for "there is neither male nor female in Christ." Gal. iii 28.] but are as the angels which are in heaven," [without any terrestrial bodies.]

But the resurrection of the body, or the "earthly house of this tabernacle," is neither defensible on Scripture grounds, nor necessary for the purpose of its being made a partner or accompaniment of the soul, or inward man, in a new state of existence. The soul, or inward man, as a transgressor against God's law before regeneration, and then only, 1 John iii. 9.—v. 18, has its acquittal from condemnation through grace. No charge can lie against it, because another has satisfied all the demands of justice, and wrought out a perfect righteousness on its behalf. Christ "was delivered for its offences, and rose again for its justification." How widely different is the case with the body, or outward man. Wasted continually by some or many of the just judgments which are the consequences and recompense of sin, it "dies daily": and when, at the appointed time, the dust out of which it was formed, "shall return unto the earth as it was," it will have fully paid all the penalties awarded by inflexible justice. "The soul (*ψη*, body) which sinneth, it shall die," was the threat. "The wages (*σολνα stipulated pay*) of sin is death," is the accomplishment. The body, or outward man, dies for its offences. Justice has no more demands upon it, and Christ therefore cannot be wanted as a propitiation. If it should rise again, though it cannot claim heaven as a reward for fulfilling all righteousness, it may of right demand a discharge from the pains of hell for fulfilling all the requirements of justice. In such case the partner of the soul will have whereof to glory, while the soul itself will receive all of Free Grace: and though the heavenly crown will not be obtained by its own merits, yet the body will never cease to boast of having escaped the torments of hell by its own sufferings. But not so—And therefore the resurrection of the body, or the earthly house of this tabernacle, cannot be defensible on Scripture grounds.

Neither is the resurrection of the body, or outward man, necessary for the purpose of being made a partner or accompaniment of the soul, or in-

thereof, but a house, a tabernacle, inhabited for a season, and quitted at the appointed time? or a clothing, to be put off when the days of his appointed time upon earth are come to an end? But man, who becomes the tenant of an earthly tenement, necessarily existed before, as he does afterwards, separately from the house in which he takes up his abode. "Forasmuch then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also," &c. It will be sufficient to have made the observation in this place, leaving for the present the application of it, both to the Head and the Body, with its members, who had, according to this Scripture, a pre-existence before they became incarnate.

Heb. x. 5—7.—"Wherefore, he coming into (εισερχομενος) the world, saith, "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body has thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and

ward man, in another state of existence. On earth the soul, or inward man, can have no intercourse with terrestrial objects without such a medium. While in a state of innocence, those objects were the means through which it grew in the knowledge of God, and its various duties and obligations to Him. Each from its different characters or qualities, reflected information, pointing out what God required to be done, or to be avoided. And now, in its fallen state, the same are continued to be the medium through which it is made acquainted with all the spiritual blessings, which are laid up for it in heavenly places. "Now we see by means of a mirror δι' ἑσποπτρου, but then face to face." "We all with open face, beholding as in a mirror κατοπτριζομενοι the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image." So far the body has its necessary use and offices to the soul, while it remains on earth. But when the soul shall be translated to the kingdom prepared for it, it will see "face to face." Now it "walks by faith," trusting to the promise of the realization of those blessings which the bodily senses report, from a contemplation of earthly things: then it will be established in all its expectancies, by an immediate ravishing "sight" of what the Spirit of the Lord had revealed to it through those things, as the substance of all its hopes and desires. With the transition of the soul from earth to heaven, the body will have lost the very design of its formation and adaptation to its spiritual partner. There will be no longer any objects on which it can exercise its faculties, no end for their employment, and consequently no use for its being the partner or accompaniment of the soul in its new state of existence.

sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure: then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God."

If an intimation only of a separate existence of the Saviour as a man, from his terrestrial body, shall be allowed to the preceding quotation, this scripture speaks in language too plain to be done away, that he had a being pre-existent to his coming into the world, and that a body was compacted (*καταρτίζω*) for its residence, until all things should be put under him. "Thou hast covered ME in my mother's womb: thine eyes did see my substance yet being imperfect, and in thy book all my members were written, *which* in continuance were fashioned, when *as* yet there was none of them." He was made a little, or for a little while, lower than the angels for the suffering of death. He was partaker of flesh and blood, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death. Because burnt offerings, which were a shadow of the good things to come, would not satisfy the justice of Jehovah for transgressions, therefore Christ, the body and substance of them, came into the world to save sinners. "Lo! I come to do thy will, O God." "A body hast thou prepared me."

2 Pet. i. 13, 14.—"Yea, I think it meet as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up, by putting you in remembrance: knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle, as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me."

The mere addition of this to the foregoing texts, will be sufficient, without entering into the subject of it, to confirm what has been so often repeated; viz. that the Inward and Outward man are not only distinct, but that the latter is unnecessary to the existence, as well as to the subsistence, of the former: yea, moreover, that to the redeemed it is a blessing to be absent from the body, that they may be present with their Lord.

The impossibility of the Saviour having an earthly tabernacle in a state of Pre-existence, has been considered as an

unanswerable objection to the doctrine now contended for. But if the texts adduced, and many others of a similar character, which will easily suggest themselves to the Biblical reader, prove that the terrestrial body is nothing more than an adjunct to the humanity, and not a part of it; that it is only a house, a tabernacle, prepared with admirable art, beauty, and perfection, for its abode while on earth; then the objection will vanish altogether, and recourse must be had to some more powerful argument, before the advocates for the doctrine in question can be pronounced, to have advanced what has no foundation in Scripture, or in the nature of things.

As many as shall admit the force of these texts, will discover additional evidence in confirmation of this fundamental doctrine of the Christian Verity; and will rejoice to see that another strong hold of the adversary is rendered untenable, as well as another stumbling block removed, which has in many instances impeded the timid traveller in the path of true knowledge.

CHAPTER III.

DETERIORATED as every human faculty is, with respect to the perception and knowledge of spiritual things, it is certain that man daily adds to the impediments that obstruct his way in the search after truth. This is done in individual instances, sometimes by unconsciously adopting the sentiments of the apostate or infidel, and sometimes by a too ready acquiescence in the errors of others, who have had their senses less exercised to discern both good and evil.

In the beginning, the wiles of the enemy were employed to separate between God and his creature man, by insinuating that the revelation which he had made of his will, was attended with some degree of uncertainty: "Yea hath God said"? and that man, instead of confining himself to the precept in its literal and obvious meaning, would become wiser by putting his own gloss, or by adopting the interpretation which some other should help him to put upon it. The adversary succeeded in his first attempt, and cast man down from his state of pre-eminent exaltation and happiness. Since that period his efforts have been unceasing, and too generally successful, in preventing the fallen race of Adam from retracing their steps to the temple of true knowledge, by means more mortifying to their pride, as they are more degrading to their sagacity and penetration. "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," might well be thought to be language too unequivocal to be misinterpreted, or to be over-ruled with the opposite assertion of "Ye shall not surely die"! But when the woman, in a state of moral perfection, could yield

up her understanding to the tempter, we are less disposed to wonder at the means since employed, and at their success among her children, whose mind is alienated from God, and all their faculties shrouded with darkness, from the lamentable effects of her fall. If the first mother of mankind, with mental powers unclouded, could listen to insinuations that Jehovah Aleim had conveyed his commands in terms which would admit of being modified, nay more, of being taken in a sense wholly subversive of their plain and literal signification; though we must lament, we cannot feel surprise when we see her sons and daughters willing, in the day of Satan's power, to adopt error for truth, and to pronounce truth to be error, in defiance of the dictates of reason, and the decisions of their daily and common apprehensions.

In the following discussion, the devices of the adversary will not be less apparent than in his first perversion of God's word, though the mischief produced by them is of a less extensive and permanent nature. Then he cast out the woman and her posterity from Paradise, now he prevails only to mar the path of the spiritual seed for a season, while they are seeking to enter into their rest, by concealing from their views the foundation on which their hope depends, viz. the covenant engagements entered into by Jehovah Aleim, before the foundation of the world, with the Pre-existent Man, the constituted Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

No portion of the Christian creed is of more acknowledged acceptance, than that there is "one God and one mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus." But the existence of the Man Jesus Christ as mediator before the world began, is rejected by almost all who bear the name of Christian, on the ground of its opposing the whole current of scripture testimony, as well as of its carrying with it something of the character of blasphemy. They deny the possibility of it, not only on the ground that his humanity must be necessarily imperfect till he became incarnate, but because his very character and actions, as the asserted pre-existent head of the

human race, are in themselves in contradiction to or above manhood, and evidently set forth the Godhead alone.

It is proposed now to examine the words or terms in which these characters and actions are described; and if it can be shewn that, instead of being peculiar to Deity, they belong properly to a creature, and are appropriate to the person of the Man Jesus Christ, the malice of the devil, in the perversion of the word of God on those very points which were intended to fortify the doctrine in question, will not only appear, but another stumbling block, which has been so sedulously laid in the way of the unlettered Christian, will be removed.

אן "A particular point of time," "a fixed time," "then."

עך "Time going on." It therefore refers to time past, as well as future: for time that is passed may be styled time going on with relation to what it then was, as well as time that is future may be termed time going on with respect to what it will then be. עך will not have two opposite or contradictory senses when thus applied, because, in either point of view, it is strictly "Time going on."

עלם and עולם "Time hidden." It therefore refers to ages past or to come, for both are hidden from man. עלם or עולם is indefinite time, not infinite. (Infinite time, if not a contradiction in terms, is certainly incomprehensible to man.) It is time whose beginning or end is not known.

קדם "Precedency," "priority," "first in time."

The Scriptures, which establish the force of the word אן contain some or other of the preceding terms, which are now proposed for consideration. Some texts, also, which are intended to confirm the force of the word עך, will be found intermixed with these, which will be brought to shew the force of the words עלם and קדם. The reader is, therefore, referred to them as they occur in the order in which the Scriptures are given to us.

Is. ix. 6.—אני עך "The Father of time past and to come."

This is a title of the Lord's Christ, who is the Father of

the whole family in heaven and earth: as well of the saints in heaven now made perfect, who were once on the earth, as of them also that are now on the earth, or of them who shall hereafter be born in the flesh, and having accomplished their days, shall be translated to heaven. He is before all things. By him were all things formed that are in heaven and that are in earth. By him all things consist: and he upholdeth all things by the word of his power. And all things as a Man: for no part of this text, rightly understood, as will be shewn hereafter, will be found to speak of him in any other character.

Is. lvii. 15—"Thus saith the high and lofty One that abideth שכן continually ער."

ער is not what Time cannot measure. It is the stream of Time flowing onward. To abide or continue as time goes on is of easy comprehension. Can as much be said of the Received Translation, "inhabiting eternity"? There is no word that denotes what is intended by eternity, viz. without beginning and without end. If there was, no creature could understand it. Nothing in nature can express it, and a finite nature cannot take in an infinite idea.

Habbakkuk iii. 6—"The everlasting mountains were scattered: the perpetual hills did bow: his ways are everlasting."

Such is the Received Translation: and if our Reformers did not intend the term "everlasting" to have two opposite and contradictory senses, of which there can be little doubt, there is an ambiguity belonging to it altogether unworthy of them, and ill adapted to the subject upon which it is employed. The original may be, and perhaps ought to be rendered in the following manner:—"The mountains, which have endured while time was going on in ages past עולם, were burst asunder: the hills of hidden time past עולם did bow: his ways are of hidden time past and to come עולם." Everlasting applied to past duration is not sense. But this meaning is given to it in the first sentence of the verse: and, on such manifest contradictions and absurdities, Arians and Socinians have grounded too many of their arguments against the Trinity and Incar-

nation, as Trinitarians have also founded their objections to the Pre-existence of Messiah, the Redeemer of Israel, as a Man.

Gen. xlix, 26—"The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors, unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills," נבעות עולם "the hills of hidden time in ages past."

The word "everlasting" applied to hills, is here also at best ambiguous. Whether our translators looked to their past or future duration may be a matter of doubt. They have used the word, in other texts, as implying an existence without beginning, and likewise without end. Neither sense can be understood in this place.

Ps. xc. 1, 2—"Lord thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or even thou hadst formed the earth and the world: even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God." The original is, "Before thou hadst formed the earth and the mundane aerial system תבל—even from hidden time past to hidden time to come, מעולם עד עולם thou art God."

It is difficult to conjecture how the Translators could have been guilty of so strange a mistake, or rather catachresis, as to render the word מעולם, supposing it could mean without beginning, by "from everlasting." That which "lasts ever" may have respect to time going onward without end, but it can have nothing to do with that which had no beginning. The proximity of the same word, from "everlasting" to "everlasting," it might have been supposed, would have prevented its being used in such immediate succession in two opposite senses, if the internal evidence of its composition, and the obviousness of its derivation, had not pointed out the error. But the wisest of men have too often written as well as spoken without reflection, or have adopted the opinions and language of others without examination. The evil, however, of such procedure, is not limited to the persons of those who are guilty of it, or to the times in which they live. Mankind

in general are unable to detect the error, of which they may probably entertain some suspicion. The consequence is, that the far greater part are content to think with those who have gone before them, and strenuously contend for sentiments of which they have no conviction whether they are right or wrong: while of the rest, some live in a state of continual suspense, whether Scripture is intended or able to lead them into all truth: and others, determining that Scripture from its apparent contradictions cannot be a safe guide, either form a creed for themselves, according to what they think the Scripture ought to have been made to say, or reject altogether the revelation which Jehovah has made of himself and his Christ. The words of the psalmist, which have given rise to these reflections, are of the same tenor and nearly parallel with Prov. viii. 22, 23, which will soon come under consideration.

Ps. xciii. 2—"Thy throne is established from that point of time מֵאָז—thou art from hidden time past מֵעוֹלָם." By מֵעוֹלָם in this place, in defiance of the marginal reading of מֵאָז, "from then," and in Ps. xc. 2—ciii. 17, an unoriginated existence, as well as an independence without beginning, is intended by the English version of "everlasting." Such is Jehovah: but such is not the meaning of the Hebrew word, or of the English term used as its representative. To make unoriginated being and "everlasting" synonymous is a solecism: for that which is "lasting ever" can have no reference to that which is without beginning. With these exceptions in the Book of Psalms, and a few others already noticed to be spoken of hereafter, the received translation makes the word עוֹלָם and מֵעוֹלָם to mean "of old," "in old time," "ever of old," "always," "long time," "ancient," "ancient times," &c. looking to some period in time which, however remote, is not without a beginning. In this scripture מֵעוֹלָם has its real signification determined by the word immediately preceding, viz. מֵאָז "from that particular point of time," for the Scriptures say not a word of any person or transaction before that period. It is only inferred that Jehovah did exist

prior to that time. The heathen, who held matter to have no beginning, concluded on the same ground that it had an existence co-œval with him.

We cannot say what the First Cause is, we can only say, by some compound term, what He is not.

Ergo: There is no simple term to express what the First Cause is.

There is no simple term which can express "without beginning," and "without end," except the Name which expresses, describes, or defines the First Cause.

But there neither is nor can be, in any language, a name which expresses, describes, or defines the First Cause.

Ergo: There is no simple term which can express "without beginning and without end."

Prov. viii. 22, 23.—"Jehovah possessed me, The Beginning, His way, The First of his works. From that particular point of time **מֵאָז**—from hidden time past **מֵעוֹלָם**, was I anointed **נִסְכַּחְתִּי**, from the beginning of time, from the times which were before the earth."

These verses assert the existence of some creature, and in such terms as leave no doubt who that creature is. He was the beginning: and the Man Jesus Christ is "The Beginning." He was Jehovah's way: and the Man Jesus Christ asserts that he is "The Way." He was the First of Jehovah's works: And Jesus Christ is "the beginning of the creation of God," "the first-born of every creature." Moreover he was all this from that "particular point of time": a moment of peculiar notation, well defined by our translators in their version of Is. xlviii. 3, 5, 7. The Hebrew runs thus, "I have declared the first things **רֵאשִׁיטוֹת**, from that particular point of time **מֵאָז**," i. e. from the first moment of time. "I have even from that particular point of time **מֵאָז**" declared it: "they are formed **נִבְרָאוּ** now, and not from that particular point of time **מֵאָז**." In these three verses the English version of **מֵאָז**, "from the beginning," has virtually given the proper meaning, though not literally correct. The

first admeasurement of time, *i. e.* in the mundane system, (and the Bible speaks of no other) began with the existence of the Man Jesus Christ. All created beings in it are within his duration. He comprehends them all: "All things were formed by Him, and for Him; and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist."

Is. xlv. 17.—"Israel is saved נִשָּׁע with a salvation of hidden time in ages past עוֹלָמִים: Ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded to hidden ages of time going onward עַד עוֹלָמִי עַד." The English version runs thus, "Israel shall be saved with an everlasting salvation." נִשָּׁע is the third singular preter tense Niphal, and must be rendered "is saved." It is not difficult to account for this obvious and important error. Neither Hebrew literature, nor, in many respects, doctrinal knowledge, was pre-eminent in the glorious days of our Reformers. Their praise is, however, in all the churches, for what they were permitted to effect; and our duty is to profit by the increasing light and information which the Spirit has afforded in these latter days. Justification by Faith was the rallying point of the polemics of those times. Justification from hidden ages past to hidden ages to come is now the theme of "every scribe which is more perfectly instructed unto the kingdom of heaven." "The preaching of the cross is *τοὺς σωζομένοις* to them that are saved—the power of God": and by this preaching "the Lord is daily adding to the church *τὰς σωζομένας* such as are saved."

Deut. xxxiii. 27.—"Aleim first in time אֱלֹהֵי קֶדֶם is *thy* refuge," *i. e.* Aleim that had the priority in time, in opposition to Aleim of the nations אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים, generally translated "other gods," but meaning "later." What opinion ought to be given of the English version of אֱלֹהֵי קֶדֶם "the Eternal God." in this text, meaning, as the word "Eternal" does here, "without beginning," will be best determined when compared with 2 Kings xix. 25—"Hast thou not heard long ago, *how* I have done it: *and* of ancient times (מֵימֵי קֶדֶם) "from the days first in time") that I have formed it." Days cannot measure *what is intended* by "Eternity": and Eternal

in that sense, if the word were capable of the signification, can with no propriety be applied to קדם. The expression "Aleim first in time" will be thought by many a palpable contradiction; but it is scripture, and proves that the term Aleim is not necessarily significant of the First Cause. In truth, it never is nor can be expressive of the Divine Essence. The error arises from Aleim being translated by the word "God" in the New Testament, supposed there always to mean the First Cause. The term "God," however, is no other than a relative term, denoting office, dignity, &c. even in the New Testament, except where it is or may be the translation of Jah or Jehovah; and in the Old Testament, where it is the rendering of Aleim, in connection with Jah or Jehovah, it always expresses some relative character of the First Cause. Among various other tests of the truth of this assertion, it will be sufficient to observe, that in the use of the word "God," it is as common as it is proper to say "My God," but no one would ever say "My Jah," "My Jehovah," or "My First Cause."

Is. xlv. 21.—"Who hath declared this from the First time מקדם? Who hath told it from that particular point of time מאז?" The connection of קדם translated "ancient time," with מאז, rendered "from that time" by our translators, serves to shew how little it has to do with that which is "without beginning," even in their opinion; to say nothing of the discordance of rendering קדם "eternal" in Deut. xxxiii. 27, and "ancient times" in this text. Our translators undoubtedly designed, as well as desired, to promote the glory of God; but they were not always consistent interpreters of Holy Writ. To what was this owing?—To the frailty of our common nature, or to their ignorance of the original? "A man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven," is a mortifying truth to flesh and blood.

Mic. v. 2—"Out of thee shall He come forth unto Me, that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth *have been* from the First time מקדם, from the days of hidden time past מימי עולם." *Margin*—"From the days of Eternity."

This text, with 1 Sam. xv. 29, margin—Is. lvii. 15, and Jer. x. 10, margin, are the only instances where the word “Eternity” is used by the received translation. The reflecting reader will determine with what propriety it can be employed in the sense there intended, and at the same time, he will see how it has been abused in the scripture under consideration, for the purpose of setting aside the otherwise obvious doctrine of the Pre-existence of the Man Jesus Christ. Days are the well known measure of certain portions of time; weeks, months, years. Eternity, or what is intended by it, is however what neither days nor any division of time can measure. To what cause then are the multiplied errors on this subject to be attributed, but to an ignorance of the real meaning of the Hebrew words, which are thus wrested to a sense which no word in any language can possibly have? In speaking and writing upon this subject, learned and godly men have often bewildered themselves, and perplexed others, with discussions upon Jehovah’s “eternal purposes and decrees,” meaning by these words, what he designed and determined before time began: referring to the first notation of time, as taking place long before the beginning of the mundane system. But the Scriptures say not a word on this subject. They speak only of what was done and is doing in mundane time, and will be done when this mundane system shall be no more. This, however, is not the only evil which such persons have occasioned. They have, by their abuse of plain scriptural terms, given rise to a somewhat similar erroneous decision, in regard to what is commonly called a Future Eternity, or that which is without end. However immeasurable the succession of time may be to all creatures after the last day of this world’s existence, yet to creatures that were made in time, and such is necessarily the case of every creature, time can never be said to be no more.* It will be the measure of their conti-

* For the sake of the mere English reader, it will be proper to remark, in this place, that the words recorded by John in his apocalyptical writings, ch. x. 6, and rendered by the English translators, “That there

nued existence, whether in heaven or hell. Time is inapplicable to that Being alone who never had a beginning. All others must of necessity be the subjects of it, unless they should become what they were when Jehovah alone existed, *i. e.* Nothing. Annihilate creation, and time is no more. While creation continues in being, time cannot cease. For though we now measure time by the revolutions of the orbs that float in the mundane system, its beginning was not computed by their motions, or even existence, nor will it end when they cease to move or to be. Time existed before the earth had, by a revolution round its axis, produced the alternation of light and darkness, and so of day and night. A first, a second, and a third revolution took place, before sun, moon, or stars were made. Time depends not upon them, though they are now made the measure of its continuation. While creation exists it must still be said, and more cannot be said, that periods like what have passed are again and again renewing their successions. The creature, who can have no idea of a past eternity, using the word in its common acceptation, and who has no positive term by which it can be expressed, must be equally at a loss to conceive or speak of an Eternity to come. As the ages of his duration multiply, his ideas of an extended existence will increase. What has been, he will rest assured, will be again. But imagination can carry him

should be time no longer," do not contradict this assertion. The original of Rev. x. 6, runs thus, *οτι γρονος ουκ εστις ουτι*, "That the time shall not be yet": but that it should commence at the end of "The time and times and half a time," and in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he should begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished. Dan. xii. 7. And John, in Rev. xvi. 16, 17, speaking of the same great event, says, "And he gathered them together into a place called, in the Hebrew tongue, Armageddon. And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done." It is singular that our learned translators should have made these references in the margin opposite to this disputed passage, and not have seen the discordance with their version. "Cease from man," "Search the Scriptures," are words which cannot be too often suggested to the diligent inquirer into the truth as it is in Jesus.

no further. With an increase of knowledge hereafter, which surpasses our present conception, it must ever be impossible for him to form any idea of an infinite duration.*

There is another Hebrew word, viz. נצח, once translated "Eternity" in 1 Sam. xv. 29 (margin), of which it will be sufficient to remark, that it is also rendered in the same margin "Victory," and in the text "Strength"; and that, as the idea contained in the verb is "Superiority," "Being above, over or beyond," our version, if it intended by "Eternity" what is without beginning and without end, is not more consistent in this than in the instances noticed already. But the reader has only to refer to the following Scriptures to see how little our translators understood the words נצח, עולם, עולמים, "Thou, Jehovah, remainest for ever לעולם. Thy throne from generation to generation לדור ודור. Wherefore dost thou forget us for ever לנצח, and forsake us so long time לארך ימים?" *Margin* "for length of days."—Lam. v. 19, 20. "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom מלכות כל עולמים, and thy dominion *endureth* throughout all generations בכל דור ודור."—Ps. cxlv. 13. "Jehovah shall reign for ever לעולם, *even* thy Aleim, O Zion, unto all generations לדר ודר."—Ps. cxlvi. 10. To be consistent, the words נצח, דר, דור, עולם, עולמים, must all relate to Eternity. The in-

* The testimony of the Jews on the words עולם, עולמים, קדם, is deserving of attention. David Kimchi on Mic. v. 2, "But say they, he who is from the days of קדם, from the days of עולם, must needs be God—that is not true, for God was before the days of עולם—whereas they say, that his goings forth were but from קדם, from the days of עולם, while the God who was of old is without beginning." Thus, according to this writer, עולם, עולמים, קדם, denote time.

R. Bechai on Gen. ii. 17, says, "The words And he lives for ever לעולם, do not signify that he should live unceasingly תכלית, but only for a definite time קצוב, as the expressions And they shall serve לעולם, And he shall abide there עד עולם."

R. Manasseh Ben Israel, considering עולם as not having the force of endless duration, expresses himself, when he would speak of such duration, by עולם עולמים.—In concil. p. 40. But with what propriety can any repetition of time, however multiplied, have the sense of endless duration.

ference is plain, viz. that none of them have any relation to it.*

These Hebrew terms are decisive to prove the perversion of the Word of God in the Old Testament, on the very points which were designed to corroborate the doctrine of the pre-existence of the Saviour as a Man. And as the Old Testament is not contrary to the New, it might safely be urged, that there is no word in the New Testament which, however perverted in a similar way, does not, when rightly understood, lead to the same result. But to satisfy the reader that this is the case, two Greek words, *αιδιος* and *αιων*, which are so wrested from their real signification, shall be adduced, and the confirmation which these will give to the doctrine in question, will be an additional testimony that, however meritorious the labours of the godly men who were employed in giving the original Scriptures to us in our vernacular tongue, their work is still capable of improvement: and that this improvement is necessary before we can have a right perception of the truth as it is in Jesus.

Αιδιος—"A succession of future indefinite time." H. Stephen derives it from *αι*, "ever" "always," as "Sempiternus is from *Semper*." It is found in two passages only in the New Testament. The LXX. have never used it to give the sense of any Hebrew word in the Old Testament, and it occurs only twice in the Apocrypha; both which instances will shew how foreign the meaning there conveyed is to that which is in one place attributed to it by our translators.

Rom. i. 20.—"For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal *αιδιος* power."

* Doctor Lowth, in his work *De Sacra Poesi Hebræorum*, commenting on Ps. civ. 5, בל חמוש עולם ועד, English version, "That it shall not be moved for ever," has these words—*Hoc est, per tempus occulto Dei consilio constitutum.* "That is, during the time appointed in the secret counsel of God." So much for the force of the words עולם ועד, rendered "for ever," according to the authority of a writer who is deservedly in high esteem for his knowledge of the Hebrew language.

Can the power here mentioned be an Attribute of Jehovah? Can an attribute of Jehovah be represented by any of the things which he has made, so as to be clearly seen? Is it not rather a person here spoken of? And do not other Scriptures allude in plain terms to that person? In Acts v. 36, Theudas boasted that himself was some one (*τινα* an extraordinary or great person). In Acts viii. 10, we read, that Simon the sorcerer gave out "that himself was some great one," (*τινα* an extraordinary person, *μεγαν* a great one): "to whom all gave heed, saying this man is the Great Power of God, ἡ δυναμις ἡ μεγάλη." Mankind had been long expecting the coming of Messiah. And did not Simon mean to induce a belief that he was that Great One, the great power of God? Certainly the men of that day considered, that by the great power of God, a creature of a like nature and character with themselves, was intended to be understood.* And in 1 Cor. i. 23, 24, the man, the Lord's anointed, who was crucified, Paul declareth to be "the Power of God." Χριστον θες δυναμιν, "Christ the power of God." The invisible things of Jehovah, even his Son, the Pre-existent Man Jesus Christ, and Himself as Aleim, or in his work of redemption, were clearly seen by the church, from the formation of the world to the incarnation of the Redeemer, being understood by the things that are made. And since the ascension of the man Jesus Christ, in the fleshy tabernacle which he took for the suffering of death, the church still sees the same glorious objects, and attains its understanding of them through the same medium.

* The following quotation from Dr. Allix, in his "Judgment of the Jewish Church," though written with another view, will not be inapposite in this place. "Acts viii. 9, where we read that Simon Magus had bewitched that people, giving out that himself was *τις μίγας*, *some great one*; he did not say what, but gave them leave to understand it their own way. And how did they take it? This follows, ver. 10: *They said πρὸς εἰς ἡ δυναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη*, *this person is the great power of God*. This they would not have said, if they had not believed that, besides the great God, there was also a person called ἡ δυναμις θεοῦ. I say a Person, for I suppose Mr. N. can't think they took Simon Magus to be only an attribute."—p. 133.

Jude 6.—“ And the angels—he hath reserved in everlasting chains *δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις* of darkness, unto the judgment of the great day.”

Αἰδιος cannot have the meaning of “ without beginning ” in this text. Nor would it have been so interpreted in Rom. i. 20, if the subject of which it is predicated had not been mistaken, viz. “ Christ the power of God,” or God manifesting himself in power in the person of his Son Jesus Christ. But this Son, as existing before all things, who in the fulness of time was made (being) of a woman, made (being) under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, by bearing their sins in his own body on the tree, viz. He of whom Paul preached as the power of God and the wisdom of God, was not in their thoughts who rendered these passages into English, and therefore an Attribute was substituted for a Person. Neither can *αἰδιος* have the meaning of “ without end ” in this place, because the duration of the chains is limited to the judgment day.

The texts alluded to above in the Apocrypha are the following:—Wisdom vii. 26, “ For she [Wisdom] is the brightness of the everlasting light, *Φωτος αἰδης*.” Wisdom ii. 23, “ For God formed man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own continued duration, *της ιδιαις αἰδιότητος*.”

In neither of these instances, as far as the authority of the author goes, and the subject matter necessarily limits the sense, is there any idea but that of “ a succession of future indefinite time.” A past existence without beginning is precluded in the first text, by a comparison of Prov. viii., and the very constitution of man, which is capable, if God should so please, of being reduced to its original nothingness, makes it impossible that an existence without end can be intended in the second.*

* Some copies read *ιδιωτος* for *αἰδιότητος*, and the context gives countenance to this reading. “ As for the mysteries of God they knew them not, neither hoped they for the wages of righteousness: nor discerned

Αἰών, with its concrete *αἰωνίος*, “An indefinite period of time, either past or future.” Its derivation is generally considered to be from *αἰε*, “always,” or *αἰεὼν*, “always being”: denoting duration or continuance of time of no prescribed or certain limit; and though much extended, yet not without limit; to which, while it continues, the epithets “ever,” “always,” are applicable.

The LXX. render it very frequently for עַד, in some hundred places for עוֹלָם and עָלַם, and twice only for קָדָם; as often for נֶצַח, and once for אַחֲרָיו—See Trommius. Jerome says, on Ezek. xxvi. “*αἰών*, i. e. *seculum* 70 annos continet:” that is, “a period which contains seventy years.”

Hesychius explains *αἰών* thus, “ο βίος τῶν ἀνθρώπων—ο τῆς ζωῆς χρόνος.” “The life of men—the period of life.”

Hesiod, Homer, Herodotus, Thucydides, Euripides, Sophocles, and Xenophon use it in the sense of *ζωή*, “natural or temporal life.”

It must be acknowledged that *αἰών* is found sometimes, but rarely, in the old Greek classics, to denote that which is “without beginning and without end.” But can it be supposed, or can Christians consistently contend, that the sacred penmen have employed that term in a sense which is to be found in no Hebrew word? Instances could be brought from New Testament Scriptures, in which Greek words are employed by them in a sense not to be met with in any profane authors, because they were ignorant of the subjects upon which the New Testament treated: and the sacred writers

a reward for blameless souls. For God formed man upright, (ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, in *integritate*) and made him a corporeal representation, εἰκὼνα, of his own character, ἰδίας ιδιοτήτος.” But the learned reader is requested to peruse the following quotation from Constantine’s Lexicon, and then to judge for himself. “*ιδιοτήτης* proprietas. A medicis dicuntur *ιδιοτήτης* ἀρρῆτοι, causæ abditæ et latentes, ut tradit. Alexand. Aphr. in præfat. lib. i. Problem. quùm quippiam solâ experientiâ cognoscitur, nec ulla ratio ab homine reddi potest, ut soli Deo nota: dicitur et *ιδίωμα* et το *ιδιον*, Ibidem. *ιδιοτήτης* τῶν σωματικῶν, corporum qualitas. Basil, in Epist *ιδιοτήτης*, εἰτ’ οὐκ ὑποκρίσεις εἰτε πρὸς ὁπῶσα, Nazianz.”

could find no others without Græcising Hebrew terms: but can it be imagined, that holy men of old designed to render a word in that language in which they thought and spoke, by a term distorted to convey a meaning foreign to its signification, and that in compliance with the erroneous sentiments, or rather ignorance of the Greeks? Knowing under what guidance they wrote, the Bible student must pronounce it to be impossible.

The difficulties which arise from the word *αιων*, in the application of it to elucidate the doctrine of the Pre-existence of the Man Jesus Christ, proceed from the misconception of its signification, by the translators of the New Testament in every language. A more accurate knowledge of the prophecies, as they relate to the two advents of Messiah, and the completion of a large portion of them, which could not be rightly understood before their fulfilment, by those learned and good men, who were so happily employed for the ages in which they severally lived, and for the times that have succeeded, enable us in this day both to discover and correct many of their errors. Led by the example of their predecessors, though contrary to the internal evidence which *αιων* carried in its composition, to consider it as speaking of what was "without beginning," they made it refer to purposes, transactions, and persons, of which the Scriptures are altogether silent. And induced by the same authorities, to impute to it also the sense of what is "without end," they extended its signification to events of which the passages where it occurs do not speak. In some texts, therefore, *αιων* is made to relate to what was before time began: in others, to periods that existed before the world was: in others, to the beginning of the world: in others, to the end of the world: and in others, to that state of existence which will literally have no period to limit it. *Αιων* is made not only to speak of times, and of the great events that have occurred in them; but to be a name of the things subsisting in time: *e. g.* of the world, or the universe itself; confounding it with *κοσμος* and *οικουμενη*,

words importing things not only altogether foreign to its meaning, but dissimilar to one another.

Some of the texts where these errors are more obvious will now be given; and it is anticipated with some confidence, that by those readers who are conversant with Prophecy, and with its fulfilment, especially in our own days, it will not be denied that a sense is given to this word, confirmatory of the doctrines of which these pages profess to treat. While every respect is paid to our authorized translation, the original must be made the only standard of doctrine, and of all just interpretation. But this will not be done, unless a substitution of some more simple terms or phrases, by which the original shall be rendered, shall take place of the equivocal expressions which our English version contains in common with all others. For this purpose, the meaning, which from its composition obviously exists in the word *αιων*, is intended to be given in the several Scriptures about to be discussed, not as expressing the scope of each passage in the best manner, but to shew that the radical sense of the word is completely at variance with that which the generality of texts in our version exhibits; and to prove also, that this radical sense, where the doctrine of the Pre-existence of the Man Jesus Christ is involved, is sufficient to remove the apparently insurmountable difficulties in the way of its reception. And it should be remembered, that whether the diffuse rendering of *αιων*, by its radical meaning, or by any appropriate single term, such as "age," "period," "dispensation," &c. be adopted, unless the radical signification be preserved unadulterated and undiminished, error will necessarily creep in, and the true sense of this important word will be lost.

Eph. iii. 11.—"According to the eternal purposes *προθεσιν των αιωνων* which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

In this text *αιων* is made to refer to what was before time began: but the impropriety will appear, when it is translated according to its radical meaning, and is considered in connection with the context. "To the intent that now unto the

principalities and powers in heavenly *places*, might be made known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the purpose *κατα προθεσιν* of the indefinite periods of time *των αιωνων* which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." Here nothing is said of what was before time began, which was undoubtedly the intention of our translators: nor is any thing advanced which alludes to God's designs or transactions by Christ Jesus before that period, when he might exist as one of God's creatures. On the contrary, the context, taken further back, makes it more evident that it refers to that point of time, when the *ברית עולם*, rendered "everlasting covenant," an expression nearly parallel to *προθεσις των αιωνων* "the purpose of the ages," was determined or agreed upon between Jehovah Aleim and the Pre-existent Man. "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ: and to make all men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the indefinite periods of time *απο των αιωνων* hath been hid in God, who formed all things by Jesus Christ, to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly *places*, might be [made] known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the purpose *κατα προθεσιν* of the indefinite periods of time *των αιωνων* which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

1 Tim. i. 17.—"Now unto the King eternal *των αιωνων*," &c.

If *αιων* is allowed to have the force conveyed in its derivation, this text is literally as follows:—"Now unto the King of indefinite periods of time," &c. Here also is nothing predicated of existence before time, or without beginning, nor of existence without end. The *αιωνες*, "indefinite times," or "periodical dispensations," of God's providence with respect to man, both before and after the days of Paul, are alone intended: times that are indefinite in their extent to the creature before completion, but determined by God in Christ

Jesus our Lord. If it be asked, is not God, or Jehovah, all that is designed in the common acceptation of "Eternal"? No doubt: but that idea is not in *αιων*, nor in any other word whatever. In these two texts, on which so much stress is laid, *αιων* has therefore no relation to what was before time began; yet it was the intention of the translators to convey this sense by the word eternal.

1 Cor. ii. 7.—"But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, *even* the hidden *wisdom* which God ordained before the world *προ των αιωνων* unto our glory."

2 Tim. i. 9.—"Who hath saved us—according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, *προ χρονων αιωνιων*."

Tit. i. 2.—"In hope of eternal life *ζωης αιωνις* which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began *προ χρονων αιωνιων*."

In these three texts, the introduction of the term "world" will strike every one who is able to read the original as very objectionable. They must allow that this ambiguous or equivocal word can have no affinity to *χρονος* any more than to *αιων*. Christ, speaking of his pre-existence in John xvii. 5, says, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was, *προ τε τον κοσμον ειναι*": not *προ των αιωνων*, nor *προ χρονων αιωνιων*. There can be little doubt entertained of Christ, and of his Pre-existence, being spoken of in the first two passages, as well as in John xvii. 5. He is called the Wisdom of God, one of his well known titles as a man, and as such distinct from God. 1 Cor. ii. 7, he is made the mediator of grace given to them that are saved and called, and as such he is equally distinguished from God as a man. 2 Tim. i. 9. And though the time when this originated is virtually the same as that expressed in John xvii. 5, yet the terms in which it is declared are altogether different in their literal signification. Christ, as a man, had a glory with God before the world *κοσμος* was arranged in its present state of

It is one of these ages, &c. of which Luke and John speak; in the texts above quoted: and of the several ages, &c. that succeeded each other till the coming of Christ Jesus in the flesh, of which Paul speaks in the last. Whatever connection there may be in fact between the beginning of the existence of the world *κοσμος*, and any one of the ages, &c. referred to, no mention is made of the world *κοσμος*, or of its beginning, or of what has been said, done, or kept secret since, or as limited to, that beginning. And the indiscriminate use of the term in these as in former instances, has assisted in extending or confirming the delusive error in which Christians have been so long held, with respect to the Pre-existence of the Man, Jesus Christ.

Matt. xiii. 38—40.—“The field is the world,—the harvest is the end of the world.—So shall it be in the end of this world.

On perusing the passage in which these words appear, any plain understanding would draw the inference, that at the destruction of the universe, or of the earth which constitutes a part of it, the procedure represented under the figure of a harvest would take place. But when it appears in the original that different terms are used, that the “world,” which is the field, is *κοσμος*, *mundus*, the *universe* or the *earth*, and that the “world,” which is then to end, is *ὁ αἰων*, *seculum*, a particular *age* or *dispensation*, and that “this world,” refers to the term signifying *age* or *dispensation*, and not to that which signifies *universe* or *earth*; the natural and obvious inference would rather be, that when the peculiar age or dispensation spoken of shall end, then shall the harvest come. Or “the field is the universe, or the earth—the harvest is the end of that age or dispensation.—So shall it be at the end of that age or dispensation.”

Matt. xxiv. 3.—“Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world? *συντελειας τῆς αἰωνος*.”

Matt. xxviii. 20.—“Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world, *εως της συντελειας τε αιωνος*.”

Hebrews ix. 26.—“For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world, *απο καταβολης κοσμου*, but now once in the end of the world *επι συντελεια των αιωνων* hath he appeared,” &c.

These passages will shew that *αιων*, which is made to express the “World,” and is used in connection with *συντελεια*, as intended to convey an idea of “the end” of that world, has no better foundation for this meaning than the foregoing passages, which have been made to give to *αιων* the sense of what preceded time, of what related to the existence of the world, or to its beginning. A mere reading of these quotations with the context, will be sufficient to establish this point. The variation in the original, which is rendered uniformly by the “end of the world,” must suggest the idea that all cannot be right; and the indiscriminate use of the term “world” for two very different Greek words, (it might have been said three, as one of them is used both in the singular and plural number) will prove that an error has been committed, whatever may have been the cause. If Christ appeared once in the “end of the world” to put away sin, how can he be with his disciples “until the end of the world”? or how can he come again without sin at the end of the world? are questions which must occur to every attentive and reflecting reader of Holy Writ. The truth is, that the first coming of Christ was “the consummation of the preceding ages,” &c. *συντελεια των αιωνων*. And the second coming of Christ, to destroy Antichrist, with the Anti-christian powers in league with him, and to bind Satan a thousand years, will be the consummation of the age mentioned in Matthew xxiv. 3.—xxviii. 20. The end of the world *κοσμος*, whether the universe, *i. e.* the mundane system, or the terraqueous globe which we inhabit, be intended, has nothing to do with these Scriptures. The expectation of a future state has existed

among men in all ages. Where the light of the gospel shone, and it should be remembered that the gospel was preached to the fathers under the old dispensation, there the indistinct views of acceptance with God, which were founded on human merit, have ever been succeeded by a good hope through grace, by the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. From Adam's day, during the patriarchal age, and till the incarnation; the Logos, who appeared to the church at sundry times and in divers manners, was seen by the eye of faith in all the sacrifices, as he who was about to come from heaven, manifested in the flesh, to take away sin by the offering of himself once. And ever since that day, this has been esteemed a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; and that having finished transgression, and brought in everlasting righteousness, the heavens must receive him until the restitution (not the destruction) of all things, when he shall come again to redeem his people from the hand of all their enemies. But a diversity of opinion has existed among Christians, in regard to the circumstances under which this redemption will be manifested. Very many consider, that, as the Christian dispensation draws nigh to its consummation, the spiritual kingdom of the Redeemer will be extended to every part of the habitable world, and thus prepare the way for his second coming: and when its close shall arrive, Christ will appear as Judge of the quick and the dead. Then they that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and come forth, and being separated one from another, the redeemed shall be set on his right hand, and the rest on his left. To these it shall be said, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire:" to those, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." And that this will be accompanied with the destruction of the universe by fire; after which the earth will never be restored, to be the habitation of men, as it was after its dissolution by

water. These deductions and conclusions, as a statement of facts which are to take place at their appointed time, do not appear to be well founded, when drawn from the Scriptures which are usually adduced on such occasions. The expressions "The end of the world," *συντελεια τς αιωνος*, and "The world to come," *αιων μελλων*, and *οικουμενη μελλουσα*, suggest a subject, and speak of events of a very different kind, when the original words are taken in their literal and obvious sense. This is capable of being satisfactorily proved; but it would be foreign to the present purpose, which is only to shew that the word of God has been, in the New as well as in the Old Testament, unhappily perverted on the very points, which were designed by the Holy Ghost to fortify the doctrine of the Pre-existence of our Lord Jesus Christ as a Man, before he was made manifest in the flesh.

Philemon 15.—"For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest receive him for ever, *ινα αιωνιον αυτον απεχης.*"

Heb. xiii. 8.—Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever *εις τς αιωνας.*"

1 Pet. i. 23.—Being born again—by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever, *εις των αιωνα.*"

2 Pet. iii. 18.—"But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and for ever, *και νυν και εις ημεραν αιωνος.*"

The opposing sense which *αιωνιος* has, in the first of these texts, to *αιων* in the last two, ought to put the considerate reader on his guard, before he determines, that the meaning which the English words "for ever" have, in their common acceptation, belongs to any of these three passages in the original. "Ever," like its correlates, "everlasting," and "eternal," has been given, without reason, as already shewn, to certain Hebrew, as well as to some Greek words. The confidence which was formerly reposed in lexicographers and commentators, who asserted that the same terms may, on dif-

ferent occasions, have opposing, and even contradictory senses, is not the characteristic of the present day. Scripture is now more generally made, as it ought always to have been, its own interpreter. And if the sacred oracles are taken for a guide on the present occasion, something very different to that state of existence which will literally have no period to limit it, will be found in the words *αιωνιον*, *εις τον αιωνα*, and *εις ημεραν αιωνος*. No doubt can be entertained by them who reverence the Bible as a revelation from Jehovah Aleim, that Jesus Christ, the Logos, liveth and abideth for ever; and that glory will be ascribed to him for ever, according to the commonly received sense of "for ever." But this sense is not intended by the words of Paul. He does not speak of the servant of Philemon as continuing with him for a period without limitation. Neither is it the design of the expressions used by Peter. His language refers to that happy day of deliverance which the church will experience from its enemies, when spiritual Babylon shall fall, when that man of sin shall be destroyed by the brightness of the coming of the Lord, and the Beast and the false Prophet shall be cast into the lake of fire. At this period, when the Son of Man shall hardly find faith on the earth, the end of the age, or period, &c. that now is, and of the ages, &c. that have been since the beginning, shall indeed come. The *συντελεια* *τε αιωνος*, or "consummation of the age," noted in Matt. xxiv. 3—xxviii. 20, will arrive at that period; but the end *τελος* will not be then. Jesus Christ will be king, for to this end was he born, and of his dominion in the world to come there shall be no end, but he must first reign a thousand years on earth with his saints gloriously; and of this it is that Peter speaks, and to this glorious period he directs the attention of the persons to whom his epistles are addressed. This also is capable of being proved from Scripture, but the present object is only to bring into review some of the many texts in which *αιωνιος* and *αιων* are made to convey a sense

foreign to the radical idea contained in them; a sense leading to the subversion of that fundamental doctrine of the Christian Verity, which these pages are intended to establish.*

Will it be deemed presumptuous to expect, that though the reader may not be yet convinced that the Pre-existence of the Redeemer, the Man Jesus Christ, is a doctrine of the Old and New Testament, he will not be altogether indisposed to grant, that another stumbling-block to its reception has been removed? Educated, as he may possibly have been, with his fellow men for generations past, to give a sense to words which they cannot bear: unaccustomed probably to think deeply on such subjects, and from his few attainments in literature, perhaps, unable to investigate for himself what their real meaning is, it will be no wonder if he has adopted, as an incontrovertible principle, what has no foundation in Scripture, and what is even opposed by his own knowledge and experience. But the time is past for errors to be received, merely because they have been sanctioned by men of great talents, and of great acquisitions in human wisdom. The bare assertion that certain words or terms, in which the character and actions of the Pre-existent Head of the human race are acknowledged to be described, are in themselves in contradiction to his Manhood, and evidently set forth the Godhead alone, will no longer pass current without examination from the reflecting reader. To such a person, it is not improbable that the Hebrew, Greek, and English words above discussed,

* A living author, of high repute in Greek literature, Dr. Bloomfield, Bishop of London, in his note on the 1006th line of the Persæ of Æschylus, edit. 2d. 1818, says, δι' αἰῶνος means Post longum tempus, *after a long time*, although it is more frequently equivalent to Per totum tempus, *during the whole time*. And in his Glossary, on the same passage, adds, δια sometimes has the force of Post, *after*. Thucyd. IV. 8. δι' ὀλίγου παρασκευῆς, post brevem preparationem, *after a short preparation*. In his Glossary on the 887th line of Prometheus Vincetus, Edit. 1824, he writes thus: Hesychius on αἰῶν says, Εὐριπίδης φιλοκτενῇ αἰῶνα τὴν φεχὴν λέγει, *Euripides in his Philoctetes makes αἰῶν to mean animal life*. Homer Il. χ. 58. φίλος αἰῶνός ἀμύθης, *thou shalt lose thine own life*. Coeph. 467. αἰὼν' ἀναίρειν, *to take away life*.

may open some new views of Divine Truth in general, and may be made subservient to unfold to him some of the devices of the enemy, and of the success with which he has employed them, in hiding from his eyes the glorious gospel of Christ, in its fundamental principles. It is no unlikely circumstance, that being led to suspect, from Scripture testimony, that there is not such solid ground for the opinions he has so long embraced, as he once supposed, he may be led to see, that, though born in an enlightened age and nation, though, like "Apollos, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures," the way of God may be expounded unto him more perfectly. He may be induced to suspect that such words as have been examined, instead of being peculiar to Jehovah are not inapposite to a creature, and that they are strikingly elucidatory of the character, offices, and work of his Christ. He may be led to see that they have been obviously obscured by the malice of the adversary, for the purpose of perverting the word of God in every language into which it has been translated, and in the end, he may be found willing to follow the train of argument which remains, to establish the doctrine in question.

CHAPTER IV.

MUCH as the difficulties which have been already discussed, have contributed to the rejection of the doctrine of the Saviour's Pre-existence as a Man, none have had more weight with the Christian world than those that arise from the following expressions, which are found in the corresponding language of the Old and New Scriptures, viz. "Son of God," "His Son," "The Son," "The Word," "The Word of God." It is intended to shew how little these ought to affect the subject before us, by proving, from many of the texts where they occur, that there is no foundation for the sense which is almost universally given to them.

Before this is attempted, it will be proper to observe, that nothing has been so injurious to the truth on this subject as the commonly received opinion among Christians concerning the Incarnation. The usual language, when it becomes the topic under consideration, is, that One of the Trine-plurality in which Jehovah has revealed himself was made flesh of the Virgin Mary, and that he then became something which he was not before: or, in other words, that he took upon him the nature or form of Man, or, as some express it, the Divine Essence was corporified.

But is such a doctrine to be found in Holy Writ? And has not this mode of speaking of the Incarnation furnished both Arians and Socinians with some of the most powerful arguments with which they supported their errors, as well as confirmed Jews and Infidels in their obstinate rejection of Christianity? The volume of inspiration in any part give counts that to raise Man from

his fallen condition it was necessary for Jehovah to be corporified or become Man? To take the words in their plain, obvious, and unforced signification, is it not a contradiction in terms to say, Jehovah became Man? And is it not inconsistent with the Scriptures to say, that Jehovah was corporified or embodied? To recover man from the effects of sin, it was necessary that the demands which divine Justice had on the human race should be fulfilled. Who could do this for his fellow men, or even for himself? None whom Adam, or any of his posterity, should generate in the ordinary course of procreation, could, from their likeness to their common parent, carry this into effect. For no sooner are they born than they go astray. They have no power in themselves to help themselves, much less have they power to redeem a brother, or give to God a ransom for him. The reason is, God is departed from them. A man must then appear, or a soul must be embodied with whom Jehovah not only is, but from whom he has never departed. A man who is not only holy, harmless, undefiled, but who, by an unspeakable Oneness with God, could not fall from his own stedfastness. A man who, when he had laid down his material bodily life for his brethren, could, by the power given him of Jehovah, resume that life at his pleasure. It is of this Incarnation that the Scriptures speak, and of this Man, who according to the flesh was of the seed of David, possessing an Individuality distinct from Jehovah, it is said by the Prophet, "Jehovah is well pleased for his righteousness sake, he will magnify the law and make it honorable": and by Jehovah himself, when this man became Incarnate, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." *

* The way to make infidels, or to confirm them in their infidelity who are already such, is to attempt an explanation where Scripture is silent. This is in nothing more apparent than in the endeavours which have been made to set forth the Essence of Jehovah and of the Soul of Man. There is no word in the Hebrew language for the Essence of either. For words in that tongue do no more than describe those peculiar qualities, conditions, or actions which distinguish one Being or Thing from

In such a statement, which the understanding of man can receive and his reason approve, there is nothing proposed as an object of faith which can be charged with absurdity, much less of blasphemy. These two allegations, however, are by many usually brought against the doctrine of Jehovah's Trine-plurality, when it is coupled with the incarnation of Him who is One of the Three. No better means can be devised to silence gainsayers, than to reject the opinions of men, and to adhere to what the Scriptures have recorded. In consulting these, it will be found that Messiah is nowhere said to be One of that Trine-plurality in which Jehovah has revealed himself to his people. Nor have the warmest advocates for that opinion even alluded to any texts where such a sentiment is unequivocally expressed; but, from their own confession, have drawn their inference from the sublime descriptions which Holy Writ gives of his origin and character, and of the dignity and importance of the offices which he was to fulfil. To these descriptions, however, there are invariably added marks which prevent his creature-character from being confounded with the Godhead. But before this shall be shewn, in discussing the topics already proposed, it appears necessary to set forth, as concisely as possible, what the Scriptures say of the Individuality of Messiah as distinct from that of Jehovah. The confounding of them has proceeded from the ignorance or rejection of the actual existence of the former before all things. If this had been understood and acknowledged, there would have been no occasion to resort to the distinctions made between the Individuality and the Nature

another, and so in no wise, because it is impossible, speak of their Essence. We cannot comprehend any thing of Essence or Existence without what we call Substance, *i.e.* something with the condition of solidity. Therefore, though we know that the First Cause exists, yet we cannot tell how, or what He is; or, in other words, we are unable to say in or of what the Essence of the First Cause exists. All the objects around us are known to us only by their properties and accidents. Of their real Essences we can observe nothing in fact, and we can conceive nothing in imagination.

of Man. The denial of the existence of Messiah, before every other creature belonging to the mundane system, and of course of any previous Individuality, since individuality cannot be without existence, led the way to the rejection of his Individuality when he became Incarnate. The tabernacle state which he then assumed, being confounded with his Manhood, is declared to be no human person, but a human nature.* It is announced that Jehovah then invested himself with that nature: and that thus corporified he became a Man, and was very Christ. How far this opinion, which has given so much offence, is countenanced by Scripture, will be best seen by a consideration of those texts which speak of Messiah when he came on earth. If they shall be sufficient to prove him to be a human Individual, and that he was a man like those with whom he conversed, the Incarnation of Jehovah will fall to the ground, and the way will be prepared for a reception of

* What is it that they intend to say who employ the term Human Nature to express their meaning, when they assert that Jehovah became Man? Their design is not to affirm that the First Cause united himself to an Individual of that race of beings called Men, who consist of a reasonable soul and human flesh: as, in that case, there would be Two persons in him whom they call Christ, and they would be obnoxious to the charge of the Nestorian heresy, viz. Two Persons, yet One Person. Will the term itself lead us to understand what they would signify by the use of it? Here the language from which it is derived must be our guide. Nature is from "Natura," which comes from Nascor "to proceed, come forth," and "Humanus," from Homo, is "of or belonging to Man." Natura humana, therefore, is "that which is brought forth, being of or belonging to Man." Their design, who use this term, is not to affirm that the First Cause united himself to the outward living frame, viz. the body which proceeded from the woman, and no more could come from her as sui ipsius generis, because, in that case, they would consent to the fundamental position of the Arian heresy, viz. that God, *Sec. divinus*, joined himself to a human body, to which no soul was attached, and to which body he was as or in the place of a soul. What do they mean then by God's taking upon him a human nature? This is one of the many difficulties which should be removed, one of the many things hard to be understood which should be cleared up, to enable the weak of Christ's flock to proceed on their way without doubts and fears. How much safer it is to adhere to Scripture phrases on all occasions, than to give our own sense of Scripture in terms of human invention!

the truths intended to follow, viz. that the terms "Son," "Word," "Word of God," &c. have no allusion to the Individuality of Jehovah, but only to the Pre-existent Messiah, "who was made of the seed of David concerning the flesh."

It has been already shewn, from certain Hebrew words, in what the Humanity consists. The peculiar character of that language, when rightly understood, is, that it leaves no doubt concerning the object of which it discourses. Each word is a substitute for something in nature or art: the design of which cannot, of course, be misinterpreted when the thing itself is well known. Any ambiguity, equivocation, or perversion of its right sense, is precluded by its carrying in and along with itself what it is intended to express. But this is not the case with the Greek language, in which some of those Scriptures are recorded, that are to come under consideration in speaking of Messiah as one of the human race. The words in Greek that are employed to express this character, are at best, in general, of uncertain derivation, and like all others, whether in that or any other language, which has been formed by man, have no meaning but what the concurring opinion of mankind has agreed to give them. The divine impress which is on the face of every Hebrew term, is here totally wanting. Collateral circumstances to be gathered from the context, must therefore lead, in all cases where there is any doubt, to a determination of the meaning which any such word is intended to convey. And, as these circumstances were recorded by holy men of God, who were moved by the Holy Ghost, there can be no impropriety in reposing full confidence in their accuracy; as there ought to be no hesitation in receiving the deductions that are fairly drawn from them.

The Old and New Testament terms for Man אִישׁ, אָדָם, אָנוּשׁ, ἀνὴρ, ἀνθρώπος, as they occur in different places, and are applied to Messiah, come now to be examined, together with the context, to prove that an Individual of the human species, not the or a Human Nature, is the object of the Prophetic and Apostolic writings: and that the Oneness predicated of

that Individual with God, even the Father, "I and *my* Father are One," is not a corporifying of the Divine Essence.

Ps. i. 1, &c.—"Blessed is The Man **הַנִּיחַ** that walketh not—but his delight is in the Law of Jehovah."

This Psalm, with the parallels in Jer. xvii. 8, Ezek. xlvi. 12, Rev. xxii. 2, speaks of Messiah. He is not only called **אִישׁ** "Man," which denotes an individual character, but **הַנִּיחַ** "The Man," an individual of especial note. He is distinguished from Jehovah as delighting in his law: and his state is strikingly contrasted with other individuals of the human race. "He shall be like a tree," &c. "The ungodly *are* not so, but are like the chaff—therefore the ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous."

Ps. ii. 2.—"The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against Jehovah and against his Messiah **מְשִׁיחוֹ**."

The repeated references made in the New Testament to this Psalm, and the application of the personal character of the Son of Mary to him who is here called Messiah, leave no doubt of whom the royal prophet speaks.

Considering him, however, as the Son of God incarnate of the Virgin, it would be sufficient to do away any suspicion of Identity between Jehovah and Messiah, to say that Anointing cannot possibly be predicated of Jehovah. But the opposition is distinctly stated to be, first against Jehovah, and secondly, against his Messiah. Could such a distinction have been made if Jehovah and Messiah were one Individual existence, a Monad, as man on earth is, subsisting of a soul and human flesh? Or would Jehovah have said of Himself, "I am anointed **נִסְכַּחְתִּי** special king **מַלְכִּי** (the ' is paragogic as in Ps. cx. 4) upon my holy hill of Zion."?

Ps. viii. 4—"What is Man **אָנוּשׁ** that thou art mindful of him, and the Son of Man that thou visitest him"?

The authority of the apostle (Heb. ii. 6—9) makes it certain that Messiah, and not mankind in general, is spoken of.

The word אָנִישׁ marks the state of an Individual of the human species, and points to an Individual of a degraded character: not merely degraded in rank or station, but in a superinduced weakness or infirmity, which did not belong to its original state. Could this be said of Jehovah corporified or become Man? But an Individual distinction is made in the letter of the text. "Thou [Jehovah] hast made him [אָנִישׁ, one brought to a low estate] a little lower, &c. Thou [Jehovah] hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou [Jehovah] madest him to have dominion," &c. And if an Individual distinction does so exist, then must not Jehovah corporified or become Man be Two Persons?

Ps. xvi. 8.—"I have set Jehovah always before me: because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved.

The New Testament application of these words, with those that succeed to the end of the Psalm, to Jesus a Man, prove that David speaketh concerning the person of Messiah. His Individual or personal distinction from Jehovah is clearly marked. "Jehovah is the portion of mine inheritance—thou [Jehovah] maintainest my lot. I will bless Jehovah who hath given me counsel. I have set Jehovah always before me." The apostle leaves no room for doubt when he declares that the resurrection of this Man, by whom God did miracles and wonders and signs, could not be confounded with David, an Individual of the human species, because David continued in a state of death, and his sepulchre remained unviolated even unto that day: of course it follows that Christ was considered by him as an Individual of that species, for whom David, another Individual, could not be mistaken. And if an Individual of the human race, he could not, according to the Orthodox scheme, be an Incarnation of Jehovah, because Jehovah must then be Two Persons.

Ps. xxii. 6—8.—"But I am a Worm, and no man אִישׁ, a reproach of men אָדָם, and despised of the people. All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they

shake the head, saying, He trusted in Jehovah that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him."

Of the person intended in this Psalm, no Christian interpreter has doubted: and if the awful fulfilment of the prophecy is considered, it will be hardly possible that a doubt of his Individual character, as one of the human race, can be entertained. Moreover, could he that trusted in Jehovah, and to whom this was opprobriously objected, be Jehovah incarnate, a Being possessed of a numerical indivisible Oneness? He was certainly considered by his murderers as One like unto themselves. "And he was not ashamed to call them Brethren," making them Individuals of the same essence and nature with himself. Of whom it is said in this Psalm, "He trusted on Jehovah, that he would deliver him." And who said, "Be not thou far from me, Jehovah, O my strength, haste thee to help Me." With what propriety can it be urged, that he was not possessed of an Individuality or peculiar personal character, who elsewhere said, "They prevented me in the day of my calamity, but Jehovah was my stay. Jehovah rewarded me according to my righteousness. I have kept the ways of Jehovah. I was also upright before him, and I kept myself from mine iniquity: Therefore hath Jehovah recompensed me according to my righteousness." And who triumphantly exclaimed, "Jehovah liveth; and blessed be my rock. Therefore will I give thanks unto thee, Jehovah, among the heathen."

Ps. xl. 6, 7.—"Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire, mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart."

Among the leading circumstances of this Scripture, concerning the application of which few readers of Holy Writ can be at a loss, the nature of the sacrifices offered unto Jehovah stands prominent. Whether these were designated by

the name of burnt-offering, sin-offering, &c. it is certain that an individual of some of the clean animals commanded by the law was intended. It was not an animal nature, if by such an expression something distinct from animal individuality is intended, that was to be sacrificed. The next circumstance that forces itself on the observation is, the Individuality of him who voluntarily substitutes himself for the legal sacrifice, which had no power to do away the future punishment of sin: "Mine ears hast thou opened, then said I, lo, I come." A third circumstance that offers itself to notice is not less striking, in respect to the personal character of him who takes the place of the appointed victim. He declares that to do God's Will, the will of his God, is his delight. "I delight to do thy will, O my God": at the same time that the record of his life and actions proves that he had a will distinct, separate, and, as it arose from and was connected with his Individual animal frame, discordant to God's will.* "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done." "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." "And he taketh with him Peter, and James, and John, and began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy; and saith unto them, my soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: tarry ye here, and watch. And he went forward a little and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from him. And he said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me; nevertheless, not what I will, but what thou wilt." The language of this Psalm throughout exhibits the contrast of one who was earnest in prayer to Jehovah, who cast all his care upon him, and was pronounced blessed in his deed. "Withhold not thou thy tender mercies from me, Jehovah;

* The advocates for the doctrine of one mind and will between Jehovah and his Son Jesus, and their number is not small, are not aware that they maintain a heresy, which in the seventh century divided the Church into two sects, and the State into two factions, viz. the Monothelites.

let thy loving kindness and thy truth continually preserve me." "Be pleased, Jehovah, to deliver me: Jehovah make haste to help me. I waited patiently for Jehovah, and he inclined unto me, and heard my cry. He brought me up also out of an horrible pit, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, *and* established my goings. Blessed is that Man **הַנָּבֵר** that maketh Jehovah his trust."

In adopting the word **נָבֵר**, a male individual of the human species, so called from his "superior strength," and thus contrasted with the female **נִשָּׂא**, "the weaker vessel," the Old Testament expresses something very different from what is intended by a Human Nature. It sets forth not only the characteristic sexual mark of an Individual of that nature; but distinguishes that Individual from all others of the same description by the emphatic **הַנָּבֵר**, **אִשְׁרֵי הַנָּבֵר**, "Blessed is That Man." The apostle Paul confirms this Individuality, by calling this Man "a Priest," "an High Priest over the house of God," who, "after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down at the right hand of God." If an Individuality be here established, it may again be asked, must not Jehovah incarnate in Jesus be Two Persons?

Ps. xlv. 2, 6, 7.—"Thou art fairer than the children of men, (**אָדָם**): grace is poured into thy lips: therefore Aleim hath blessed thee for ever.—Thy throne, the Aleim, [of the heathen, viz. the heavens. Ps. ciii. 19, is a parallel passage, "Jehovah has prepared his throne in the heavens." As also Is. lxvi. 1, "The heaven is my throne."] is for ever and ever **עוֹלָם וָעֶד**: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore [the living] Aleim, thy Aleim, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows,* **חֲבֵרִים**, "associates, compa-

* The testimony of Luke and Paul agree in attributing these words to Messiah. He is declared to be pre-eminent among the children of men, and therefore blessed of God, and anointed of him with the oil of gladness above his fellows.

nions." Can Individuality, and that of the children of men, be more plainly declared?

Ps. lxi. 8, 9, 16, 17.—"I am become a stranger unto my Brethren, and an alien unto my Mother's children. For the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me. Hear me, Jehovah, for Thy loving kindness is good: turn unto me according to the multitude of thy tender mercies: and hide not thy face from thy servant עֲבֹד, for I am in trouble, hear me speedily."

This Psalm speaks also indisputably of Messiah. "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." But his distinction as One of the human species, is not more explicitly noted, in that he had Brethren, than in his having a distinct and separate character and Personality from Jehovah. For thy sake (Jehovah of hosts, Aleim of Israel) I have borne reproach; shame hath covered my face. Thou hast known my reproach, and my shame, and my dishonour: mine adversaries are all before thee." And especially in these words, "But I am poor and sorrowful: let thy salvation, O God, set me up on high. Hear me, Jehovah, and hide not thy face from thy servant, מַעֲבֹד: from him that obeyeth thee." Can Individuality be more marked?

Ps. lxxxix. 19.—"Then thou spakest in vision to thy holy One, and saidst, I have laid help on one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people. I have found David [דָּוִד the Beloved] my Servant, &c.

If chosen out of the people, he must be an Individual of the people. But the verbs are all in the past time. "Thou spakest." "I have said." "I have laid help." "I have exalted." "I have found the Beloved," דָּוִד, not David, the son of Jesse, which the tenor of the whole Psalm contradicts. And if the Beloved was then One of the people, must He not have an Individuality distinct from Him who laid help on him, and exalted him; must he not also, together with them, have had a Pre-existent state before Incarnation? He the First-

born, in the fulness of the stature of Man, before all ages: they only evolved and obtaining a consciousness of their rank and privileges in the scale of Being when partakers of flesh and blood, that he might have the pre-eminence in all things. He the Tree of Life first planted in the garden of God, whose seed was in Himself; they that Seed to be brought forth, each at his appointed time to become, like Him, plants of renown, and to be finally transplanted, together with Him, into the heaven of heavens, there to remain for ever monuments of that Mercy, Grace, and Love, which passeth understanding.

Ps. xci. 10—13.—“There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling. For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in *their* hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone. Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample *under thy feet*.”

The principal part of these words is quoted by two Evangelists, and is referred by them to Messiah, as the person who should be delivered, and highly exalted over his adversary. The whole of the Psalm bears its testimony that Jehovah Aleim addresses him as the subject of peculiar salvation and great honour. If an Individuality, when applied to mankind, mean a particular man or woman, the individual character of Messiah cannot be more plainly exemplified than in these words. “Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night, nor for the arrow *that* flieth by day: a thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand, *but* it shall not come nigh thee. There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling.” And if the definite and precise characters of Individuality which distinguish one Being from another, whether of the same or of a different essence or nature, are to have any weight, the individual and separate existence of Jehovah from his Christ, can also admit of no doubt in the following words, “Because thou hast made Jehovah a sure refuge. [מחס' with the paragogic or emphatic ']

even the Most High thy habitation, there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling; for he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways," &c.

Ps. cx. 4.—"Jehovah hath sworn, and will not repent, thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec."

Jehovah is introduced in this Psalm as speaking to another, and this other is known from New Testament authority to be the Pre-existent Messiah: "Jehovah said to my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." It is also added, "Jehovah shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion. The distinct personal Incarnate Humanity, not the Human Nature devoid of Personality, of Messiah, is likewise fully declared in these words; "Jehovah hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." Messiah is here declared to be a priest on his throne, by the name "Melchisedec," which by interpretation is King of Righteousness.* A

* Many doubts have been entertained concerning Melchisedec, who is supposed to be spoken of in this place, and some obscurity hangs over his character as a type of Messiah. The story is briefly related in Gen. xiv. 18—20. Paul expounds it of Christ in Heb. v. 6—10.—vi. 20; but more at large through chapter vii. Few circumstances are recorded of Melchisedec; perhaps to intimate to the believer how little the real character of his Antitype is revealed, not only to the children of men, but to the sons of God: for "a man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven." Melchisedec's father and mother are unknown. The same may be said of Messiah. For believers, generally speaking, are ignorant of Jehovah as his father bringing him into existence before the foundation of the world; and unbelievers universally reject his manifestation in the flesh by the Virgin mother, maturing and bringing forth her own seed. Melchisedec is said to be without beginning of days or end of life: the Scripture giving no account of his birth, nor recording the time of his duration on earth. In this "he was made like the Son of God": for even believers are little acquainted with his original existence as God's only Son or ever the earth was, and unbelievers refuse to listen to the glad tidings of his ever-living to make intercession for transgressors. Of the more notorious parts of Melchisedec's character it is unnecessary to enlarge. He was king of Salem. Messiah is the prince of peace, a priest upon his throne. He brought forth bread and wine to Abram. Messiah has left the same memorials

Scripture running parallel with Zech. vi. 12, 13, "He [the man whose name is the Branch] shall be a priest upon his throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between them both," viz. Jehovah of hosts, and the Man the Branch. The peculiar marks by which the Individual creature-character or Personality of Messiah is distinguished from Jehovah, makes it impossible that he should be an Incarnation of Jehovah, according to the orthodox scheme: and the words of Jehovah himself, place an insuperable bar against the supposition of his embodying himself in the creature of his hands, to whom he swore that he would give him an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and a kingdom which shall not be destroyed. Jehovah said unto אֲדֹנָי him whom he had made the ruler, unto him to whom all power is given in heaven and in earth, "Sit thou on my right hand," &c. for Jehovah shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion. Be thou ruler in the midst of thine enemies. Thou art a Priest for ever על דברתי, in the matter of the King, the Righteous One."

Ps. cxviii. 21—23.—"I will praise thee, for thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation. The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is Jehovah's doing: it is marvellous in our eyes."

to his Church. He received offerings of Abram in whose loins were all the typical priests. Messiah receives offerings of them that are made priests unto God. He blessed Abram in the name of the Most High God, asserting his superiority over the father of the faithful: for "without contradiction the less is blessed of the greater." Messiah blesses in the name of the Father all the spiritual seed of Abraham. He is greater than Abram, before Abram he was; and whom he blesseth, is blessed indeed. Of Melchisedec as priest there is no record of any of his family or race that went before, or followed after him. Messiah derived his priesthood from none that was before him, for he was the first-born of every creature, and has transmitted it to none, because he continueth ever, having an unchangeable priesthood. "Of Melchisedec (Paul says) we have many things to say and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing." If the Apostle had stated all he had to say, the Hebrews, his own countrymen, would have been not a little surprised: yet he nevertheless declares those apparently "hard things" to be no more than "the first principles of the oracles of God."

In this instance, the last intended to be taken from the Book of Psalms, there are accumulated proofs of all the points already brought before the reader, viz. the Individuality of Messiah as a Man; the separate existence of Jehovah as distinct from Messiah, and the very opposite of what is so generally laid down as the foundation of the Christian Verity, viz. the Numerical Oneness of Jehovah, and the human nature which he is said to have assumed. The individual character of Messiah as a Man, and the line of distinction drawn between him and Jehovah, will be evident from a slight inspection of the contents of the Psalm: *e. g.* "I called upon Jehovah in distress, Jehovah answered me, and *set me* in a large place. Jehovah is on my side, I will not fear: what can man do unto me? Jehovah hath chastened me sore: but he hath not given me over unto death." The application of this Psalm in the New Testament Scripture to Messiah, is every where couched in language which from its plainness and precision, makes it no easy matter to the most tortuous ingenuity to evade the deduction, that an Individual of the human species, a male, who had passed through childhood and youth to years of maturity, was spoken of in contradistinction to Jehovah, who had fulfilled his engagements of support to him in every trial, and had given him complete deliverance from the malice and cruelty of his enemies. "And when they had set them in the midst, they asked by what power, or by what name, have ye done this? Then Peter filled with the Holy Ghost said unto them, Ye rulers of the people, and elders of Israel, if we this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by what means he is made whole; be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at nought by you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under

heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts iv. 7—12. After this testimony, and the Apostles' declaration that they would persevere in proclaiming it, when they were suffered to return to their company, the voice of thanksgiving and supplication was thus raised among them with one accord: "Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is: who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together, against thee, Lord, and against his Christ. For of a truth against thy Holy Child [*παῖδα*, "Servant." See verse 25.] Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done. And now, Lord, behold their threatenings; and grant unto thy servants that with all boldness they may speak thy word, by stretching forth thy hand to heal; and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy Holy Child [servant] Jesus." Acts iv. 24—30.

It is not necessary, after giving the above Scriptures, to multiply passages from the prophets on this subject, but the reader is referred to the following, as a further confirmation of the position that has been laid down, viz, that the Incarnation of Jehovah is not a revelation of Scripture, and that on the very ground upon which the doctrine is attempted to be established.

Is. xxxii. 1, 2.—"Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment. And a Man *אִישׁ* shall be as an hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest."

Jer. xxiii. 5, 6.—"Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David the Branch, the Righteous One, *צֶמַח צְדָקָה*, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah

shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this *is* his name whereby Jehovah shall call him, Our Righteousness."

Both these Scriptures are considered by Jewish and Christian expositors to speak of Messiah: and as they elucidate each other they are placed together, for the purpose of shewing how little foundation there is for the generally received opinion of Jehovah being Incarnate. Isaiah speaks of a Man **וְיָ** who was to be an instrument of deliverance from wrath: This man he declares should be a king, in whom there should be no iniquity. "A king shall reign in righteousness." The parallel passage in Jeremiah distinguishes between this king and Jehovah, in words which when properly translated will go far to satisfy the reader, who is anxiously searching after the truth, that no great dependence is to be placed on their authority, who identify the Individuality of Jehovah with that of Messiah: and who, in express terms, which have provoked the reprobation of the adversary, and have offended the feelings of the believer, have asserted, that the great end of Jehovah, as One of the Trine-Plurality in which he is revealed, appearing in the flesh, was, to repair by his death and sufferings the evils sustained by the fall. "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will raise unto David the Branch, the righteous One, and a king shall reign," &c. Words more pointedly expressive of Two Individual Beings, can scarcely be found. Jehovah speaks, and declares what he will perform unto David, viz. that a branch shall grow out of his roots. A branch is well known to be of the same character with its root: and as David was an Individual of the human race, subsisting of soul and body, so must his branch or offspring be likewise. This Branch was to be a king, a notation likewise of Individuality among the sons of men, *who should* reign, according to Isaiah, in righteousness, and in the words of Jeremiah should execute judgment and justice in the earth." But the succeeding words of Jeremiah, when properly rendered, are most decisive against the asserted Individuality, or Numerical Oneness of Jehovah with Messiah. "And this *is* his name whereby

Jehovah shall call him; our Righteousness." It is unnecessary to enter into any defence of the translation of this part of the prophecy, the propriety of which is opposed chiefly on the ground that it is not countenanced by the Massorethæ.* No violence is offered to the construction. All is simple, plain, and unforced, agreeing with verse 5, "I will raise unto David the Branch, the Righteous One." To him the term "Righteousness" evidently refers, as it does in the almost parallel passage in Jer. xxxiii. 16.† But in what other Scriptures is Jehovah described as the Righteousness of his people? No where that the writer is acquainted with in the

* The deficiency of the Masorethæ, which is not accurately stated, as Kennicott mentions five Masoretic Editions of the Hebrew Bible which favour the proposed translation, is amply compensated by an authority, which is deemed by a large portion of the Christian world in no wise inferior: viz. the Septuagint Version, where Jer. xxiii. 6, runs thus, "In his days both Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell in confidence, *πισποθως*: for this *is* his name which the Lord shall call him, Josedec," *ταυτο το ονομα αυτου, ο καλῃσει αυτον Κυριος, Ιωσιδαικ*. Whatever the Septuagint translators intended by the first syllable in Josedec, two things are certain: first that they rendered יהוה "Jehovah" or "Lord" by *Κυριος*, and made it the nominative to *καλῃσει* "shall call," making a clear distinction between Jehovah and the Branch, the Righteous One, the King, whom he should raise up to David.

† The opposition between Jer. xxxiii. 16, and Jer. xxiii. 6, according to the Received and other Versions is easily rectified. "And this *is the name* wherewith Jehovah shall call her [the Church] his Righteousness, or the Righteousness of him": viz. the Righteousness of the Branch, who in chapter xxiii. 5, is termed "the Branch, the Righteous One"; and in chapter xxxiii. 15, "The Branch of Righteousness." It may seem strange that this obvious way of reconciling the two passages, by giving to *υ*, in chapter xxxiii. 16, the no uncommon sense of the pronoun third person singular, has not occurred to the numerous critics, especially when it is confirmed by New Testament Scriptures. "Christ Jesus of God is made unto us Righteousness." "He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him." The text of Jeremiah xxiii. 6, and the margin of 1 Cor. i. 30, exhibit a striking instance of good and wise men halting between two opinions. In the former we have "Jehovah our Righteousness" given in Capital letters: and in the latter we are referred to the former for a confirmation of the truth that Christ Jesus is our Righteousness in consequence of his being made such to us by Jehovah.

Old Testament. In Is. xlii. 6, 21, it is said, "I Jehovah have called thee [Messiah] in righteousness." "Jehovah is well pleased for his righteousness sake." In the New Testament, Christ is said to be "of God made unto us Righteousness": and "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Nor can it be justly urged that the prophet would have written יקרא לו, if the sense of his words as above stated had been what he intended. See Parkhurst on Jude 11, 31, under עלה II. See also under זדום for an instance of י being substituted for לו. The Jews apply the words of Jeremiah in this place to Messiah: but the disagreement among their commentators concerning what is predicated of him, is no mean proof that all was not quite clear to them on a point which the Christian world, with very few exceptions has adopted.

It will be interesting, and perhaps not altogether without profit, to extract a few passages on this subject from the writings of Jewish authors, who lived before as well as after the appearance of Messiah in the flesh. Jonathan Ben Uzziel's words in his interpretation are ודין שמיה דיהון קרין ליה "And this is his name which they shall call him, There shall be wrought out for us righteousness from before Jehovah in his days." Abarbinel, in his commentary on this place, acknowledges that among his countrymen were some "who affirm, that the name of the Messiah is only, Our Righteousness, and nothing more; by no means Jehovah: and that the meaning of the passage is, This is his name by which Jehovah shall call him; for it is he who shall then call him by the name of Our Righteousness." His words are פי' נכון וימ" שלא היה שם המשיח אלא צדקנו בלבד לא שם ה' ויהיה פי' הפסוק הזה שמו אשר יקראו ה' כי הוא יהיה זה הקורה אותו בשם צדקנו :

Alshech, in his commentary, does in fact make a similar concession, though his sentiments run a very different direction. He says, "The Messiah shall be Righteousness; that is to say, by means of

his righteousness and uprightness there shall descend an abundance from heaven upon Israel; and the Messiah shall be as it were the channel through which it shall be abundantly poured upon them, and from him diffused among all the people. And this is what is intended by Jehovah our Righteousness: as if the Scripture had said, In the same manner as Jehovah causes an abundance to come unto that which is about to be made clean, and which is indeed cleansed, so shall the Messiah resemble the blessed Jehovah, and his name shall be called, Jehovah our Righteousness; for from thee shall our righteousness be drawn as it is from Jehovah. The meaning of the Scripture is, that though in his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, yet they shall not therefore give him a name because of their salvation and safety; but on account of the righteousness and uprightness which shall abundantly flow to them by his means: and this is what is intended by Jehovah our Righteousness."

ומשיח ה' צדקנו לומר ונו:

Jarchi says, "י' צדקנו י' מצדיק אותנו בימי של זה, Jehovah our righteousness, that is, Jehovah shall justify us in the day of this" [man]. And Kimchi on the same Scripture ישראל יקרא חמשיה בזה השם. י' צדקני לפי שבימיו יהיה צדק ישראל shall call the Messiah by this name, Jehovah our Righteousness, because in his days the righteousness of Jehovah shall be continually with us, it shall not at any time depart."

It is evident that the words of Jeremiah in this passage are applied to Messiah, though they are not understood by each writer in the same way. The individual character of Messiah is, however, acknowledged: and such as have attributed the name of Jehovah to him, leave no doubt that they intended nothing more than that Jehovah will justify Israel through him.

Abarbinel, whose sentiments are most accordant with the language of Christian professors in the present day, speaks, in his commentary on Isaiah xi. 1, in terms that do away alto-

gether the notion of an Incarnation of Jehovah. "And this (viz. Righteous Branch) is his name, which Jehovah our righteousness shall call him."

Is. i. 4—9.—"The Lord God [אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה] hath given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary: he wakeneth morning by morning, he wakeneth mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back. I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting. For the Lord God [אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה] will help me, therefore shall I not be confounded: therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed. He is near that justifieth me; who shall contend with me? Let us stand together, who is my adversary? Let him come near to me. Behold the Lord God [אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה] will help me; who is he that shall condemn me?"

The history of him of whom all the prophets did write as it is recorded in the Evangelists, with the application which Paul has made of it in his epistle to the Hebrews, leaves no doubt of whom Isaiah speaks in this passage. And a bare reading of his words will be sufficient to satisfy the Biblical student, that the Messiah whom he describes is an Individual of Mankind in the lowest state of humiliation, distinct from Jehovah. What the prophet just touches upon here is expressed more fully in the quotations which follow.

Is. lii. 13, 14.—"Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. As many were astonished at thee. His visage was so marred, more than any man אִישׁ, and his form more than the sons of men אָדָם."

Is. liii. 3, 4, 6, 10.—"He is despised and rejected of men אֲנִישִׁים"; a man אִישׁ of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid, as it were, our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. All we, like sheep, have gone

astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord [יְהוָה Jehovah] shall prosper in his hand."

Both these passages speak of Messiah. In the first he is characterized as servant עֶבֶד of Jehovah Aleim of Israel, and is called a Man אִישׁ, with the peculiar outward form of the sons of men אָדָם. These surely are marks as decisive of human Individuality, as they are of a distinction between him and Jehovah. In the second passage, he is described as a man אִישׁ of sorrows, despised and rejected of men אִישִׁים, Individuals of a similar character with himself; and he is distinguished from Jehovah Aleim, who was considered as smiting him, who laid on him the iniquity of us all, who put him to grief, and whose pleasure was to prosper in his hand. With what congruity or consistency with the orthodox creed can these Two be supposed to constitute a Monad or Numerical One?

Zech. vi. 12, 13.—"Thus speaketh Jehovah of hosts, saying, Behold the man אִישׁ whose name is the Branch; and he shall grow out of his place, and he shall build the temple of Jehovah: even he shall build the temple of Jehovah, and he shall bear the glory, and he shall sit and rule upon his throne, and he shall be a priest upon his throne."

Zech. xiii. 7.—"Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man נָבֵר that is my fellow עִמִּיתִי, saith Jehovah of hosts: smite the shepherd and the sheep shall be scattered."

Few passages of the prophetic writings contain so many, and none perhaps more proofs, in so small a compass, of the several circumstances under discussion, than these from Zechariah. Jehovah of hosts is the speaker. He points to another, and describes him as the Branch that should grow up out of his place, and build the temple of Jehovah. It is

needless to repeat, on this occasion, what has been said on the word Branch. It must partake of the same Essence with the root from which it springs. He was also to rule upon his throne. A throne distinct from the throne of Jehovah; as is set forth in Rev. iii. 21, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my Father in his throne." He was moreover, to be a Priest upon his throne: as Paul also describes him, the "High Priest of our profession Christ Jesus, who was faithful to him that appointed him." But this Person of whom Jehovah speaks, has likewise other characters of Individuality as a Man, as well as a distinction from Jehovah. He is a Shepherd, who was to be smitten, and whose sheep were to be scattered. And, what is still more decisive, he was the Man, not the Human Nature, but an Individual of that nature with a peculiar note of sexual distinction, נבר, who should be not Jehovah become man, not Jehovah corporified, but the Fellow עמית "associate" of Jehovah; or, in the language of John x. 3, "I and my Father are one."—ch. xiv. 10; "Believest thou not that I am with the Father, and the Father with me"?* The identity of Jehovah with Messiah, making them, as many do, convertible terms, or the

* If the original in John xiv. 10, 11, and xvii. 21, be attentively considered, and compared with the translation of the preposition *μετ* in Rom. i. 9, and Rev. vi. 8, it will appear that no improper liberty has been taken in rendering the passages in John and Paul as above. Learned Divines have called the doctrine contained in John xiv. 10, 11—xvii. 21, *μετασχυσμους* and "Circum-incession," as also "Mutual-Inexistence." Would not the rendering of the preposition *μετ* by *with* free the several texts from all obscurity, not to say absurdity and contradiction? Of God we can comprehend nothing, but that he is incomprehensible. A heathen being interrogated on this subject wisely answered, *Hoc tantum scio, quod nescio*. The quotation from Zech. xiii. 7, confirms the sense given, pointing out the character of the union which subsists between the Father and Christ to be a fellowship, or according to the Hebrew a "With-ness," or "Near-ness," עמית. The term עמית cannot from its etymology have a higher meaning. In all other places where it occurs it denotes no more than a neighbour or fellow citizen, and is far from implying identity of Essence or even equality of rank.

embodying of the Divine Essence, or, according to others, the Descent of One of the Trine-plurality from heaven, who, by the co-operation of the Holy Ghost, assumed in the womb of the Virgin the nature of Man, appears to be a doctrine which has no countenance from the Scriptures above quoted.

The agreement of the New with the Old Testament on this subject, will be seen from the passages which follow.

Luke xxiii. 27, 28, 33, 35. "And there followed him a great company of people, and of women, which also bewailed him and lamented him. But Jesus turning unto them, said, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children. And when they were come to the place which is called Calvary, there they crucified him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand and the other on the left. And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also with them derided *him*, saying, He saved others: let him save himself, if he be Christ, the chosen of God."

The Women who bewailed and lamented Jesus could have seen him in no other light than as an Individual of the human species. This Jesus confirmed when he said, "Weep not for me, but for yourselves, and for your children." The circumstance of fixing him upon a Cross proves that it was not a human nature, a something distinct from Individuality, but an Individual of that nature: as did the taunts of his persecutors, who acknowledged that he had by his power saved others from the death of the body, but was unable to save himself. The peculiar title which they gave him of "the chosen of God," was a convincing circumstance how far they considered the Messiah, whenever he should appear, not to be an Incarnation of Jehovah, but Him of whom it was said, "I have made a covenant with my chosen"; "I have exalted *One* chosen out of the people"; and "Behold my servant whom I uphold, mine Elect *in whom* my soul delighteth." And the words of the Saviour when he prayed for his murderers, and of course when he acknowledged himself to be a Man, for a Human Nature, that is A Something distinct from

Individuality, could not be slain, confirms all that has been advanced in opposition to the very current opinion, that **Messiah** is not an Individual of the human race, or possessing **Personality**, but an **Incarnation of Jehovah**, or **Jehovah in a Human Nature**.

Acts iii. 12—15. “And when Peter saw *it*, he answered unto the people, ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk? The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses.”

Acts x. 38—40. “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil: for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did, both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem: whom they slew and hanged on a tree: Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly.”

The distinction in the first of the above quotations between **Jehovah**, **Aleim** of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, and his Son **Jesus**, is made in terms which repel every doubt, and which take away the very matter of disputation. Peter tells the men of Israel who were gathered together in Solomon's porch, that **Jesus** whom they had delivered up and denied before Pilate and killed, God had raised from the dead. Are these circumstances such as can lead a reflecting mind to conclude that **Jehovah** and his Son **Jesus**, whom he thus glorified, are not distinct in their Individuality? But, that his distinction as one of the human race might stand unimpeached and unimpeachable, the Apostle declares, that this same **Jesus** was he of whom **Moses** spake when he said that **Jehovah** their **Aleim**

would raise up to them of their Brethren, a Prophet, like unto him; and that every soul which would not hear him should be destroyed from among the people.

The distinction in the second quotation between Jehovah and Jesus of Nazareth, is expressed in words which seem also to preclude the very possibility of a mistake. Jesus was hanged on a tree and slain. God raised him up the third day. God anointed him. God gave him power: Thus appointed of God, and enabled to do his Father's work, he went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil. The commission which was given to him and which he executed to the benefit of his fellow men, is declared to be fraught with so many blessings, not because he was the Most Highest veiled in the flesh, but because God was with him, as an Individual of the human race, possessing a distinct Personality.

Rom. v. 1, 10, 11, 12, 15. "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only *so*, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement. Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. But not as the offence, so also *is* the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God and the gift by grace, *which is* by one Man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many."

With this portion of Scripture it is intended to conclude the remarks that will be made on this division of the subject. In the first verse the Apostle contrasts God with Jesus Christ. "We have peace with God through (*διὰ*, the efficient cause) Jesus Christ." This is in perfect agreement with what he says in another place, "God who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he hath loved us—hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together and made *us* sit

together in heavenly *places* in Christ Jesus, that in ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus." But that the Individual character of Messiah might be clearly seen, and that he might not be confounded with Jehovah, he adds, " But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ, for he is our peace, who hath made both one—that he might reconcile both unto God in one body on the cross." In the other Four verses, the personal character of Messiah, as a Man, is placed in a point of view which no ingenuity can pervert. Sinners as enemies are reconciled to God, *καταλλαγημεν τῷ θεῷ*, by the death of his Son. They have joy in God through Jesus Christ, by whom the reconciliation is obtained, *καταλλαγὴν ἐλαβομεν*. And this Son and Reconciler is designated by the same term *ανθρωπος* as all other men, and is contrasted by this term with Adam, the first Incarnate Individual of that order of Beings called Man. " Wherefore as by one man *ενος ανθρωπου* (Adam) sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and death passed upon all men *παντας ανθρωπους*. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, *which is* by one Man *ενος ανθρωπου*, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many."

It must not be dissembled that some texts are to be found in the Manuscripts from which the received Version was made, that seem to favour the idea combated in the preceding pages. The circumstance of their being so few in number, with their evident opposition to the general tenor of Scripture, are however sufficient to induce every wary reader to suspect that error has crept into these places, or into the interpretation of them. But such readers as have access to the writings of the pious and laborious investigators of these difficulties, have something more than mere suspicion that all is not right. They have reason to conclude from the collation of Manuscripts, that error has actually found its way into

some of these disputed passages: and that when they are restored to their several right readings, or a right interpretation is given to the words in which they are expressed, there is a perfect agreement between them and every other part of Holy Writ on the fundamental point of Jehovah and his Messiah.

John xx. 28. "And Thomas answered and said unto him, my Lord, and my God!"

The language in this place of the once unbelieving but now convinced Apostle, has been brought by every commentator and expounder of Holy Writ, as an irrefragable proof of the doctrine which the Church of God is said to have held from the earliest days of Christianity, on the subject of Jehovah's incarnation in the person of the Virgin Mary's Son. It is not presuming too much to say that a little reflection might have prevented the triumph which the scoffers of our holy faith have obtained on this occasion, and spared the Church the mortification of being convicted of a blunder, which a novice in theological disputation could hardly be supposed capable of committing. "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless but believing"; were the words of Jesus. And what was the conviction that followed in the mind of Thomas? Upon seeing the print of the nails, and the healed wound of his side, and ascertaining, by the application of his hands to each part, that there was no delusion of sight, he said to Jesus, "My Lord and my God!"

Whatever the feelings of the Apostle might be in respect to the person of his Master, the language in which he clothed them was undoubtedly Hebrew, that being the vernacular tongue of the Jews long after this period, see Acts xxi. 40.—xxii. 2. His first words were most probably אֲדֹנָי, "My Lord or ruler," from דָן to "rule, direct," with the formative א and the pronoun suffix י. They could not have been either יְיָ "Jah" or יְהוָה "Jehovah," with the י "my" in construction,

no instance occurring of such a form, and the nature of things, whatever language was used, precluding the possibility of it. Of Jah and Jehovah no nation or individual can say, He is Our or My Jah or Jehovah: for Jah or Jehovah is a Proper Name, and it is only to Nouns significant of character, relation, or dignity, that possessives can be applied.

The same may be said of the concluding words of Thomas' confession. "My God" could not, for the same reason, have been either יה "Jah" or יהוה "Jehovah," but must have been a Noun of character, relation or dignity, with the pronoun suffix ' "my."* Whatever Hebrew term of any such import

* It has been observed by Bp. Middleton in his "Doctrine of the Greek Article, Part II. Note on John xx. 28," that the objection made, viz. that "Thomas did not call Christ *Jehovah* in the words there addressed to him, because the Affix is never applied to *Jehovah*, is frivolous, for it might just as well be urged that the God invoked by Christ in Matt. xxvii. 46, Mark xv. 34, where Christ exclaims My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me? was not the true God, yet it was never doubted whether Jesus in these words addressed *Jehovah*." To this it may be replied, that the words "Eli, Eli," in Matt. xxvii. 46, and "Eloi, Eloi," in Mark xv. 34, each of them the rendering of אֱלִי אֱלִי in Ps. xxii. 1, like the term "My God" in John xx. 28, is an Attributive Noun with the Affix, and which term as it does not and cannot in itself, whether with or without the Affix, mean *Jehovah*, so it is known to be predicated of the creature as well as of *Jehovah*. If the "Eli," "Eloi," and אֱלִי of these passages have any thing in common with the "Emmanuel," *Εμμανουηλ*, of Matt. i. 23, and who can doubt it when reference is made to the original אֱלִי נִי עִם in Isaiah vii. 14, it may be "doubted," and with good reason, "whether Jesus in these words addressed *Jehovah*." "Eli," אֱלִי in Matt. i. 23, can mean no more than the Inward Man of the Redeemer. (See Note at p. 110.) Why may it not do the same in Matt. xxvii. 46, Mark xv. 34? It was the Inward Man that "forsook" or "laid down" the Outward Man, and that afterwards "took it up again" in John x. 17, 18. And might not Thomas address himself to that Person in John xx. 28? At all events the objection is not so frivolous, nor the subject so free from doubts as Bp. M. has pronounced it. It is much to be lamented that the bias or rather prejudice which education had occasioned in him was not corrected by a more accurate knowledge of the Hebrew tongue.

It will not be foreign to the subject to observe in this place, that the marked difference of the words *ΗΛΙ*, *ΗΛΙ*, "Eli, Eli," in Matt. xxvii. 46, and *ΕΛΟΙ*, *ΕΛΟΙ*, "Eloi, Eloi," in Mark xv. 34, both the rendering of

might have been used on this occasion, whether אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהִי, to each of which the ׳ in construction might have been added, because they are Attributives and not Proper Names, it is evident that the First Cause was not intended to be declared

אֱלֹהִי in Ps. xxii. 1, is urged as a proof, that Hebrew was not the language in which our Lord spake on the Cross, and that of course Hebrew was not the vernacular tongue of the Jews at that time. But if Hebrew were not the language then in common use with the seed of Abraham, why was the "accusation" of Jesus written according to Luke in letters of Hebrew, *ον γραμματος Εβραιου*, and according to John "in Hebrew," *Εβραϊς*? The words *Ηλι, Ηλι,* in Matthew are evidently the original אֱלִי, אֱלִי, Græcised: and the assertion made by many, that the words *Ελοι, Ελοι,* in Mark, are Syriac, can proceed only from the adoption of a common but untenable opinion, that Hebrew was not then the vernacular tongue of the Jews. Jesus must have either used both expressions, or both are resolvable into one and the same expression. The rapid utterance of the stronger passions will not allow the supposition of the former. And the arbitrary insertion of Vowels in the common speech of the Hebrews after a consonant, whether that consonant be succeeded by another consonant or a vowel, is so well ascertained from high authority, that the latter opinion claims our immediate assent. The manner in which Hebrew was read, and of course also spoken, in the Third Century, is ascertained from the fragments which remain of the Hexapla of Origen. From these we learn, as Jerome likewise affirms in the most express terms to be the case in his time, that the Jews were not nice in the selection of the intermediate Vowels which they inserted after the consonants; the inhabitants of one country or province differing widely, in their mode of speaking, from those of another. This will sufficiently account for the slight difference in the Orthography of the exclamation of our Lord on the Cross as given by the Two Evangelists. *Ηλι,* "Eli," and *Ελοι,* "Eloi," are therefore resolvable, each into a suitable enunciation of אֱלִי in Greek characters, according to the style or habit of the writer who employed them: and no proof can be drawn from their *prima facie* apparent dissimilarity, that the Saviour spoke in any other terms than those which the Psalmist predicted, or that Hebrew was not the vernacular tongue of the Jews at the time of the Crucifixion.

In that part of the Hexapla where the Hebrew Text of Genesis i. is converted into Greek characters, the following conversion and insertion of Vowels, as bearing upon the point in question, is found.

In verse 1. בראשית	is read	Βρασιθ,	the ך being converted into θ.
אלהים		Ελωσημ,	the ך being converted into ω.
2. חמים		αμωιμ,	the vowel α being inserted between the consonant ך and the vowel י.

by the Apostle as dwelling in the tabernacle taken from the body of the Virgin, but that he confessed, that "Jesus Christ our Lord, which was of the seed of David according to the flesh, was the SON OF GOD with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." Who the Son of God is, or to what scale of Being he belongs, will be found discussed in another place (See Chap. V.): and this text, on which so much stress has been laid as proving the Incarnation of Jehovah in the person of the Virgin's Son, is necessarily to be classed among those, the interpretation of which has been unduly warped to confirm a doctrine which has no existence in the Oracles of God.

Acts xx. 28. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Every pious and reflecting mind revolts at the necessary consequence of holding the doctrine that God must have bled and died, &c. But to escape the dilemma in which they,

In verse 5. ולחושך is read *ελασσεσυχ*, the vowel *α* being inserted after the consonant *λ*.

7. ויעש *υιαας*, the vowel *α* being inserted between the vowels *ι* and *γ*.

מעל *μααλ*, the vowel *α* being inserted between the consonant *מ* and the vowel *ע*.

8. שמים *σαμμαιμ*, the vowel *α* being inserted between the consonant *מ* and the vowel *י*.

The following extract from another part of the Hexapla, as hinging on the same topic, will not be unacceptable to the critical student.

Hos. xj. 1.

Το ΕΒΡΑΙΚΟΝ
כִּי נָעַר יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְאֶחְבָּתוֹ וּמִמְצֹרִים
קִרְאֹתִי לְבָנִי

Το ΕΒΡ. ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΟΙΣ ΓΡ.
ὡς νεγ Ἰσραὴλ ὑπαβη
υπαμμεμοσραιμ παραβι
λεβανι

A perusal of other parts of the Hexapla will confirm the remarks made above, and will leave no room for doubting, as far as the various readings in Matthew and Mark of the words spoken on the Cross are concerned, whether the Hebrew tongue was vernacular or not at the time of the Crucifixion.

who advocate the several readings of the Received Version on this point, have found themselves involved, they have made choice of a mode of explanation which savours more of ingenuity than sound judgment. Their salvo is, that it is allowable to say that God could bleed, &c. by a *κοινωνία ιδιωμάτων*, or by attributing a communication or interchange of properties between the One God and the One Mediator between God and men, the Man Jesus Christ. But is there occasion for such a supposed communication or interchange of properties? Or can it be admitted consistently with the dissimilarity which exists in the parties concerning whom this communication of properties is predicated? The corporeal and spiritual parts of man are indeed widely if not essentially different, yet the properties of the one may with the strictest accuracy of language be attributed to the other, because soul and body in the same person are closely, naturally and necessarily connected. The same cannot be said of the union of Jehovah with flesh and blood. Heresy has been imputed to Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, and to those who have adopted their sentiments with various shades of difference. But are they without blame, who, if they have not laid the foundation of such heretical pravities, have done more by rejecting some truths and adopting some errors to establish these perversions, than any ingenuity of the heretics themselves could ever have effected?

The opposers of the fundamental positions of the Christian Faith saw the absurdity of the *κοινωνία ιδιωμάτων*, "communication or interchange of properties," and protested against the mischief which ensued from the adoption of it. They pointed out also one source of the errors which led the way in many instances to the necessity of employing such an absurdity: viz. the false readings which had been introduced by men over zealous to guard the truth. But neither they nor their opponents knew the only way of extricating themselves from the mazes of that labyrinth in which they were both entangled. They saw not, or seeing they would not acknowledge, a

pre-existent Messiah in the person of the Man who in the fullness of the time was manifested in the flesh. While defending what each conscientiously thought to be the truth, neither party was aware of the opening which each left for the other to assail his adversary with success. Probably Trinitarians, in their zeal to establish their views, put θες "God" into the text for τὸ κυρίον "Lord," which is found in the oldest Manuscripts. Others among them who designed to remedy an evident falsification, probably restored κυρίον with καὶ "and" before θες, making the reading κυρίον καὶ θες, "Lord and God," as it is found in some Manuscripts.* The Anti-Trinitarians, assured that God could not bleed, and that Scripture speaks of "Christ an High Priest, who neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood entered into the holy place," and that "the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, will purge the conscience from dead works to serve the living God," have opposed the harsh and incongruous way of speaking, which would resolve this knotty point by allowing a communication of properties. Neither of them was enabled to see that the incarnation of which Scripture spoke was not an Incarnation of Jehovah, but of his Messiah. If the reader, after consulting the Collators of Manuscripts on this text, should be satisfied that the word θες is not a legitimate

* τὸ θεον is found in few Manuscripts, and none of high or of even considerable antiquity. τὸ κυρίον is found in several of the most ancient Manuscripts, or other early documents, viz. In the Alexandrian of the sixth Century—In Ephrem of the seventh—In the Cambridge of the fifth or sixth—In Archbishop Laud's of the seventh or eighth—And in Greek Manuscripts of the twelfth and thirteenth Centuries. τὸ κυρίον καὶ θεον is found in a very great many Manuscripts, but none of high antiquity. Supposing it to be the genuine reading, and Granville Sharp's rule applied to it, making the phrase to be understood of One Person, it does not follow, that He whose blood purchased the Church was therefore Deity. "Take heed—to feed the Church of Him being [or who is] Lord and Mediator, which he has purchased with his own blood." ὁ κύριος is indeed the rendering of יהוה Jehovah, but has never that meaning when applied to Jesus Christ in the New Testament.

part of this verse, but that according to the authority of the best Manuscripts, the words *τὸ κρυπτόν* ought to be substituted for it, he will not hesitate to reject this passage as furnishing a sufficient evidence of the Incarnation of Jehovah: and will have no objection to acknowledge, that, if it be necessary to consult the harmony of Sacred Writ, consistency requires that it should run thus: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of the Lord, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Or if *ὁ Θεός* should be found the right reading, it is not however necessary that it should mean the First Cause. It may be so rendered as to have reference to the One Mediator between God and men, the Man Jesus Christ. See pp. 109, 110.

Rom. ix. 5. "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ *came*, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen."

If attention be paid only to the letter of the English Version, it must be confessed that this text speaks most strongly in favour of the Incarnation of Jehovah. But no one, who has heard of the doubts which have been entertained whether it can be supported consistently with the general tenor of Scripture on this subject, ought to rest content with what our Version has given on the present occasion. Nor should he, if he be a competent judge of the Greek tongue, remain satisfied with the apparent sense which is to be drawn from the words themselves. The Manuscripts afford no materials for the correction of any error that may be suspected. The reader is therefore reduced to this alternative, to take the passage in the common acceptation of the words, as speaking of Jehovah under the appellation of Christ, and of course as Incarnate, in contradiction to every other text, in which the Titles of Christ or Messiah is made peculiar to the prophet spoken of in Deut. xviii. 18, 19, or to pronounce that the words of which it consists do not contain the sense which is attributed to them. Will it be deemed unreasonable, since

it is impossible that Scripture can contradict itself, to suspect that this insulated text may convey a meaning which at first sight does not appear probable to the English reader, or even to the Greek Scholar? The latter is especially to be reminded that the words *θεος* and *Κυριος* are the rendering of Hebrew words of very different significations, and therefore whenever the original terms can be ascertained of which *θεος* and *Κυριος* are translations, an unerring clue is afforded and then only for arriving at their right meaning. The present passage is not among those which are taken from the Old Testament, and of course no direct evidence can be given of the sense which the Apostle intended to fix to *θεος*. Collateral or inferential testimony is all that can be obtained.

In the first place, then, it deserves to be noted, that many of the Fathers, in commenting on this Scripture, have denied that Christ can be called *θεος*, meaning Jehovah, over all.

Secondly, *θεος* is the rendering of the following Hebrew Words by the LXX. יהוה, אלהים, אלוה, אלה, אלים. אל, אדנים, אדני, אביר. As far as their authority can bind, and few Greek scholars of the present are disinclined to pay every possible deference to those translators, *θεος* does not in this place necessarily imply that Jah or Jehovah is intended.

And thirdly, though the New Testament writers, in quoting the Hebrew Scriptures, have rendered יהוה and יהוה by *θεος*, yet they have also repeatedly made *θεος* to represent some of the other of the above mentioned Hebrew terms, which are attributed in common to Jehovah and Man.

It is therefore possible that *θεος* in Rom. ix. 5, may be a term applicable to the Man Christ Jesus. And as it is possible, and so very many texts must be exposed to the charge of contradiction if it be rendered God in the acceptation of Jah or Jehovah, it will not be an unnatural or a forced interpretation of the word to give it any one of these senses, which is most applicable or best adapted to make the passage consistent with the general language of Holy Writ on this subject. The choice of the Hebrew term must be left to the

reader's discretion: but the unavoidable necessity of attributing it to the First Cause vanishes, and with it all the weight which it is supposed to have in establishing the doctrine of the Incarnation of Jehovah. The sense in which the writer is disposed to view it is as follows: "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ *came*, who is over all, the Mediator לֵא [Compare Matt. i: 23, with 1 Tim. ii. 5.] blessed for ever. Amen." *

* What has been here said, may be applied to Matt. i. 23, "Behold a Virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us." A Virgin is to conceive, her offspring is to be a male child, and this male child is to be, for such is the force of the Hebraism, "They shall call his name," Emmanuel, which, being interpreted, is *El* or לֵא , שִׁמְעֵנוּ , with us. שִׁמְעֵנוּ is an equivocal word. It is the rendering for Jah and Jehovah, names given only to the First Cause, and for לֵא , &c. names of character, office and relation, attributed equally to Jah, Jehovah, and his creatures. שִׁמְעֵנוּ may therefore in this place mean only some character, office or relation which the male child is to sustain. And if the context be considered, what other inference can be drawn, than that the Virgin's son is the promised לֵא "Mediator," one distinct in Essence from Jah, Jehovah; confirming that Scripture, "For *there* is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jesus Christ."

A similar clue will lead us through the supposed difficulty in Mark ii. 7, "Why doth this *Man* thus speak blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but the *Man* Mediator alone? compared with Acts v. 30, 31, and in John x. 33, "The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy: and because that thou being a *MAN*, makest thyself God, שִׁמְעֵנוּ . The Jews announced Jesus, whom they had just before required to tell them plainly whether he were the Christ, to be a Man: and then accused him of blasphemy, because he being a man, born as they supposed after the ordinary generation of men, Joseph the carpenter his father, and his brethren and sisters distinguished in nothing from others, had declared himself to be the Messiah, לֵא , the Mediator, had assumed the authority of dispensing life hereafter to his followers, and claimed the power of preserving them in the full possession of it. It requires no reflection to determine that the Jews did not stone Jesus because they supposed that he, whom their senses as well as their knowledge of his past life and conversation evinced to be a Man, not a Human Nature but one possessed of Individuality, pronounced himself to be a corporifying of Jehovah of hosts. Their anger arose from the circumstance of a person of his mean appearance assuming to himself the high character of that delegate from Jehovah, whom Moses had foretold

1 Tim. iii. 16. "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

It appears from the Collators of the Manuscripts of the Greek Testament, that *θεος* has in this text been substituted for *ὁς*. Neither the ancient reading of the Alexandrine, nor of any Manuscript of the Western empire has *θεος*. It is also contradictory to the internal evidence of the text itself. The authenticity of *θεος* rests on Manuscripts of a late date, and upon the doubtful testimony of some of the more recent Greek Fathers, and is supported by no evidence of an earlier antiquity than the fourth century. "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness." A mystery is some sacred thing, hidden or secret, which is naturally unknown to human reason, and is learned only by a revelation from Jehovah. That Holy Thing which contains all that redeemed Man can desire to know, and of which this Scripture speaks so fully, is the Man Christ Jesus. He is "the Wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden *wisdom* which God ordained before the world unto our glory." To Him,

should be raised up from the midst of them like unto himself, in whose mouth Jehovah would put words, and to which if they hearkened not he would require it at their hands. Their wrath was excited against Jesus because they considered that he claimed, like Moses, to stand in the place of Jehovah Aleim; to be the great Prophet, Mediator and Intercessor of the people of Israel, presenting their wants to Jehovah, and as the predicted representative of Jehovah. If the words used by the speaker were מְנִישׁ and מֵ, and their language certainly was Hebrew,* the translation ought to run thus, "For a good work we stone thee not: but for blasphemy: and because that thou, being in the likeness of sinful flesh, מְנִישׁ, makest thyself the Mediator מֵ."

* Josephus, Bell. Jud. lib. v. c. 9, § 2—lib. vi. c. 2, § 1, when sent by Titus to address his besieged countrymen, spoke to them "in the Hebrew dialect," *ἑβραϊζων*, and "in his mother tongue," *τῇ πατρὶς γλώσσῃ*: and this was not that he might be better heard, but that he might make himself known to the Jews as their countryman. In what language then is it probable that Paul addressed his fellow citizens a few years only previous to the siege of Jerusalem, Acts xxi. 40—xxii. 2? And Peter his hearers, "the men of Judæa, and all the dwellers at Jerusalem," Acts ii. 14, forty years nearly before that period?

as the predicate, the word ΟΣ may be considered to refer: *q. d.* "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness. He who ΟΣ * was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the Spirit, was seen of angels, was preached unto the Gentiles, was believed on in the world, was received up into glory."

Upon the supposition however that the argument is untenable, and that ΟΣ cannot be substituted for Θεός, it does not follow that Θεός has necessarily the sense of Jehovah. The various meanings which it is capable of bearing, as have been stated in pp. 109, 110, leave an opening for restoring this text to a sense consistent with other Scriptures: and standing upon this vantage ground it may be confidently anticipated that no valid objection can be made to the following rendering: "Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: Θεός the Mediator [He who was Emmanuel, הוּא "the Mediator" עִמָּנוּ "with us," when the Virgin brought him forth in the flesh.] εφανερωθή was manifested in the flesh, εδικαιώθη was justified in the Spirit, ωφθῆναι was seen of angels, εχηρυχθήναι was preached unto the Gentiles, επικεκευθῆναι was believed on in the world, ἀνελήφθῆναι was received up into glory!"

Tit. ii. 13. "The glorious appearing of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

This text also is by many considered as confirmatory of the Incarnation of Jehovah: the omission of the article before σωτήρ, &c. identifying "Jesus Christ" with the "great God." This argument will however appear of little weight when the force of the word Θεός is attended to, more especially in connection with τὸ μέγαλόν, "His Name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty Mediator, הוּא גִבּוֹר," (See pp. 109, 110, for the meaning of הוּא) "The glorious appearing of the great Mediator, even our Saviour Jesus Christ," may therefore, and according to G. Sharp's Canon must, be the right rendering; the term Θεός being an

* A similar construction of ος is to be found in Mark iv. 25. Luke viii. 18. Rom. viii. 32. See the original and the English Translation.

attributive Noun, and therefore not speaking of the First Cause; and Jesus Christ though identified with *θεος*, not of necessity losing his Creature-Character. See p. 120.

Heb. i. 8. "But unto the Son, *he saith*, thy throne, The Aleim *ὁ θεος* [of the Heathens, viz. "the Heavens."] is for ever and ever."

This text will not, any more than the preceding, when its evidence is duly weighed, be found to authorize the inference usually drawn from it, of the Deity of Him who is called Son. Translators and Commentators having drawn their conclusion before the premises were understood, have united in pronouncing *ὁ θεος* to be the vocative case, referring to the possessive *σς* "thy," rather than to *θρονος* "throne," to which it is placed in apposition. "Thy throne, the Aleim," i. e. the object of heathen worship, "is for ever and ever," *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*. Heb. עולם ועד. See p. 50, &c. or The Aleim is thy throne for ever and ever. In Ps. xlv. 7, to which Paul here refers, the word translated God, and which is supposed to be equivalent to Jehovah is אלהים, a term applied in that place to them that are called Gods, but are not the true, the living GOD, but the false Aleim, the work of his hands, by whom the only true and living God formed all things—The Host or army of Heaven by which he doeth his will on the Earth—That which once rendered homage to the Prince of the powers of the air, but now owns the Son, to whom all power is given, as its liege Lord.

In the Old Testament the Heavens are sometimes denoted by the word אלהים, as in Ps. xlv. 7, which Paul here quotes, as also in Ps. viii. 6.—xcvi. 5.—xcvii. 7, the uniform rendering of which is *ὁ θεος* by LXX. But see the observations on Ps. xlv. 6, 7, at p. 84, to satisfy the reader, that this text is not one of those which is calculated to confirm the doctrine of the Incarnation of Jehovah in the person of him who is termed "The Son," and whose Creature-character as an Individual of the human race is so evident from the succeeding words, "The sceptre of thy

kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

I John iii. 16. "Hereby perceive we the love *of God*, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down *our* lives for the Brethren."

The words "of God" are in none of the Greek Manuscripts, nor in the Oriental Versions. The original therefore may be said to run thus: "Hereby perceive we love, because he laid down his life for us." If however an Ellipsis is to be supposed, it may be supplied in two different ways, either by the addition of the words "of God," as the Complutensian Edition and the Vulgate Version read the passage; or according to the reading of the Syriac Version, by the insertion of the words "his" and "to us," "By this we know *his* love *to us*," or in agreement with the Ethiopic Version by the insertion of the word "his" only. By this we know *his* love." If the first should be preferred, it will be asked from, whom this love springs which is manifested in so peculiar a way? The Scriptures which elucidate the text may be brought to shew that it is from God. John, in his gospel, chapter iii. 16, says, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son": and in his first Epistle, chap. iv. 9, "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him." God then is the fountain of love, as he is of every good gift. But though the words "of God" may without impropriety be inserted, it does not follow that God is the antecedent to which "he" *ἐκεῖνος* refers. On the contrary, it appears that it was the Son of God, who ~~was~~ manifested in the flesh to take away our sins: and that by the "Son of God" so manifested is intended the Man Christ Jesus, who died, and who alone could take away our sins by dying for us. "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." This is confirmed by the context: "And we ought to lay down our lives

for the brethren": *q. d.* "Therefore," *ναυ*, having this example of the Man Jesus Christ, God's dear Son, we who are also in the flesh ought, whenever occasion shall call for it, to lay down our lives for the brethren. But though the words "of God" may be added, it is not necessary that such an Ellipsis should be adopted. The rendering of the Syriac or Ethiopic Version, if an Ellipsis must be employed, is not of inferior authority to the Complutensian Edition and the Vulgate Latin Version. And both of them being evidently taken from the succeeding part of the verse, lead to him who alone could lay down his life, the Man Jesus Christ, God's dear Son, who is set forth as an example for us to follow his steps. "Therefore we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." "This," says the Saviour, "is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Whatever confirmation the language of the Apostle in this passage may, by the insertion of the words "of God," apparently bring to the generally received opinion that Jehovah is incarnate, and by a communication of properties may be said to lay down his life, they do not in fact contain any such sense, but rather refer to his only begotten Son mentioned in verse 8. And as this reference will elucidate the text, it will be sufficient to read the passage as found in the original. "Hereby we perceive love, because," &c. The word "God" is previously found no where in this chapter but in connection with the words "Son," "Children," "Born of," and is therefore with no propriety introduced as a necessary Ellipsis. The expression "Son of God" is: and as he is said to be manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil, the word *ἐκεῖνος*, "he," may very suitably have regard to that antecedent, and the Incarnation of Jehovah pronounced to have no foundation as far as this text can be said to sanction it.

1 John v. 20. "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, *even* in

his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life."

This is the last of those texts that the author is acquainted with upon which the favourers of the opinion, that Jehovah is Incarnate, have rested with more than usual confidence. Attention to the manner in which a part of it is rendered in other places of the Received Version, and to the construction of the language of the inspired writers in different passages, as well as to the context, will rescue this text from the imputation of supporting the idea combated in the former part of this chapter. In the seventeenth chapter of his Gospel, the Apostle John has plainly distinguished between God and his Son Jesus Christ: "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." In the text under consideration, our Translators have not only lost sight of this distinction, but have confounded the Father with the Son by the insertion of the word "Even." "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, *even* in his Son Jesus Christ." The omission of the word "Even," and the rendering of the preposition *εν* by "through" as in other places, viz. Acts iv. 2. Rom. iii. 25. Eph. ii. 7. 1 Pet. i. 1. 2 Pet. ii. 3, would have prevented this error, "We are in him that is true, Through his Son Jesus Christ"; and would have prepared the reader for the proper antecedent to the demonstrative pronoun *ουτος* which begins the concluding sentence of the verse. Our Translators, in common with their contemporaries, as well as with their predecessors, from an early period of the Christian æra, having been accustomed to consider the term "Son of God" as meaning One of the Trine-Plurality in which Jehovah is known to his Church, and being also accustomed to confound the name Jesus Christ with that person of the Godhead, not only thought they were justified in inserting the word "Even," but considered that they were under the necessity of doing so, to mark that Ident-

tity, and to give the right sense of the passage. Their error is however now sufficiently obvious: and nothing more is requisite to reconcile this text with every other part of Scripture, than to allow the preposition *εν* the not uncommon signification of "through," and to refer the pronoun *ουτος*, "this," to the antecedent *τη αληθινω*, "him that is true." "We are in him that is true, *τη αληθει νω*, through his Son Jesus Christ. This [viz. He that is true] is the true God *αληθινος θεος* and eternal life." Nor is any violence done to the construction of the Greek language, by referring *ουτος* to a remote antecedent, as the following instances prove. "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know. Him *τητον* [Jesus of Nazareth] being delivered," &c. Acts ii. 22, 23. "Till another king arose which knew not Joseph. The same *ουτος* [another king] dealt subtilly," &c. Acts vii. 18, 19. "For many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This *ουτος* [each individual of the many] is a deceiver and an Anti-Christ." 2 John 7. But besides this way of meeting the text, there is another which is sufficient to invalidate its force as tending to establish the doctrine of the Incarnation of Jehovah, if *ουτος* should not be allowed to have respect to a remote antecedent, viz. that *θεος* does not necessarily mean The First Cause: and the passage will run thus: "This [Jesus Christ] is the true *θεος*, *ης*, Mediator, [See p. 109, 110.] and eternal life."

No other than the above instances occur to the recollection of the writer of these pages, in which the doctrine of the Incarnation of Jehovah is considered to be unequivocally stated in Scripture.* And he leaves it to the Biblical student to

* Matt. xix. 16, 17, and the parallel passages in Mark and Luke's Gospel, appear of so plain solution as hardly deserving notice. "Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *There is no man or per-*

determine whether all or any of them have been advisedly brought by its advocates to prove the point in dispute.

If other proofs were necessary to shew the futility of the idea that Jehovah was Incarnate, the recorded character of Jesus Christ in the apostolic writings when he was manifested in the flesh would be sufficient. Has his conception in the womb of the Virgin, his distinction at the future birth as a male child, the prophecy of his royal estate as the successor to the throne of his father David, the continuance of that

son, *υἱός*, a good man or person *αγαθός*, but one man or person *εἰ μὴ ἓς*, the Mediator, *ὁ Σωτὴς*, i. e. *ἄν.* See *Matt.* i. 23, compared with *Is.* vii. 14. It is not true that there is none good but Jehovah. The One Mediator between God (Jehovah) and men, the Man Jesus Christ is good. He "knew no sin." "He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" "The prince of this world cometh and hath no part in me." It will probably be urged, that no creature, whether angel or man, is absolutely or in himself good, and that God alone is so. But it could not be the intention of the ruler, who called Jesus Master, to impute an absolute perfection to him. It was a derived goodness only, and that as coming from God, which was in his thoughts. Jesus however knowing that Goodness unmixed with evil was the portion of One Man only, rebukes the speaker for giving him a title which could belong to That Man alone, when he did not know, and consequently could not mean to proclaim him to be That Individual. "Why callest thou me a good man? There is no man a good man, but One Man, The Mediator."

John x. 33, is also of a similar character. "For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy: and because that thou being a man *ἀνθρώπος* [a partaker of all the infirmities consequent to Adam's transgression, *ῥίζα*, a root out of a dry ground, without form or comeliness, with no beauty that we should desire thee] makest thyself the Mediator *Σωτὴς*, *ἄν.*, i. e. the Man whose name is the Branch, who is to grow up out of his place, and build the temple of Jehovah, and to bear the Glory, and to sit upon his throne." To which may be added, "Why doth this *Man ὁυτός* thus speak blasphemies? Who [*τίς* what man] can forgive sins but *Σωτὴς*, i. e. *ἄν.*, the Mediator, only?" *Mark* ii. 7. "Who [*τίς* what man] is this *Man ὁυτός*, which speaketh blasphemies? Who [*τίς* what man] can forgive sins, but the Mediator alone, *εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ Σωτὴς*?" . e. *ἄν.* *Luke* v. 21. "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." *Acts* v. 30, 31.

government and kingdom, any thing to do with a Human Nature, a something falling short of Individuality, which was assumed by Jehovah, and which if it was a corporifying of Jehovah must speak of Mary as the mother of God or Jehovah? Do not these several circumstances rather carry with them decisive marks of an Individual of an order of Beings similar to her of whom he was born; similar also to him whose kingdom he was to inherit? Have his humility and lowliness of mind, his self-denial, his content in the mean condition in which he was born and lived, any thing in common with a Human Nature, or a something short of Personality? Do they not denote the peculiar character of an Individual of that nature, and distinguish him from every other of the human species? For of whom could it be said as it was of him, "He knew no sin," "He is altogether lovely"? What in short have his faith and frequent and extended exercise in prayer, together with his ardent thanksgiving and praise to the Father, to do with a Human Nature, or, which cannot be too often repeated, of that which falls short of Personality? Do they not designate an Individual character strikingly contrasted with the rest of the sons of men, and infer an absurdity of the grossest kind as often as the assertion is made, that he who prayed and thanked and praised Jehovah, was Jehovah himself corporified?

The Bible student will not attempt to controvert the maxim given by Solomon, viz. "*There is no new thing* under the sun," though the application of it will not be acceptable to him whenever it is found to oppose any erroneous view which he may have taken of the word God. Beza, whose name stands pre-eminent among the critical expounders of Holy Writ at the time of the Reformation, was honoured with being an instrument of recovering a long lost Canon of the Greek language on the Definitive Article. To this some eminent critics of later date have made large additions. After laborious researches into the remains of the authors who have written in that tongue, from the days of Homer to the latest

of the Greek Fathers, they have pronounced that nothing can be brought to invalidate the force of this Rule, the ignorance of which had given the character of tameness and uncertainty to a language remarkable for its great accuracy and philosophical precision of expression, and by the recovery of which they have effected, though unwittingly and unwillingly, the restoration of a fundamental truth, which had for ages been buried in the rubbish of Monkish superstition. The reader's attention is requested while a reference is made to the above mentioned Canon, which stands as the First Rule in Granville Sharpe's Treatise on the uses of the Definitive Article in the Greek text of the New Testament, as also to the more expanded and elaborate Work of Bp. Middleton on the same subject. The further confirmation of the sentiments already attempted to be established in this chapter, is the object now proposed.

Mr. Sharpe's first Rule is as follows:—

“When the copulative *καί* connects two nouns of the same case (either substantives, or adjectives, or participles) of personal description, respecting office, dignity, affinity, or connection, and attributes, properties, or qualities good or ill, if the article *ὁ*, or any of its cases, precedes the first of the said nouns or participles, and is not repeated before the second noun or participle, the latter always relates to the same person as is expressed or described by the first noun or participle.”—*i. e.* it denotes a further description of the first named person.

In Bp. Middleton's Work on the Greek Article this rule is thus expressed. “When two or more Attributives joined by a Copulative or Copulatives are assumed of the *same* person or thing, before the first Attributive the Article is *inserted*, before the remaining one it is omitted.” In a Note subjoined the Bishop adds, “There is a large class of Nouns which are truly assumable Attributives, (as well as Adjectives and Participles) I mean all those significant of character, relation, or dignity: to these the Canon may be expected to apply.”

As an exemplification of the Rule, quotations are made from the New Testament, some of which are rendered by our Translators in conformity with the doctrine contained in it, and so have not only established the Canon, but triumphantly confirmed the view given of the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ by the orthodox for many centuries: Others however have been rendered in a different sense, so as to conceal from the English reader the character which it is affirmed belongs to him, and is contained in the original words.

The author has already expressed his sentiments of the intrinsic worth of the Canon which has been happily rescued from the obscurity in which it was so long involved, but he differs from the able and conscientious men who have been the instruments of its recovery, in the application which they have made of it to the Person of Jesus Christ. That the latter of the Attributive nouns *Θεός*, *Κυρίος*, and *Χριστός* in every instance adduced, always relates to the same person which is expressed or described by the first, he readily admits. But he has no hesitation in asserting, that the prejudices imbibed in early years, and confirmed by the subsequent study of the writings of men in preference to the simple Word of God, have misled these students, whose natural talents were as exalted as their integrity was unimpeachable, in the sense which they have given to the noun *Θεός*, and consequently to the doctrine which they pronounce to be established by it. In their haste to confirm what their zeal has prompted them to assert to be the truth as it is in Jesus, they have forgotten the terms of their own definition. The Rule says, "Nouns of personal description respecting office, dignity, affinity or connection." Whereas in the doctrine deduced from the Rule, viz. that *Θεός*, *Κυρίος*, and *Χριστός* are correlates or further descriptions of the person named, and that *Χριστός* and *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* being *Θεός*, is therefore Jehovah, they argue on *Θεός* being a Proper Name, signifying the First Cause, instead of considering it to be according to their own Definition only an Attributive Noun, or a noun of character, relation,

office, or dignity. This is put beyond a doubt in those places where *θεος* has the pronoun *ημων* in construction with it, and where it cannot be a Proper Name. Besides, in those places where *θεος* stands alone, it is not necessarily a name denoting the First Cause, but is according to the Canon an Attributive Noun, further describing the Person of Christ or Jesus Christ, and it may be added, must be so considered to make the Scriptures consistent with themselves.

The passages to which Granville Sharpe's Rule are applicable, are the following. The reader is requested to weigh well their force, first, as bearing upon the doctrine which has been currently received by the orthodox, and determined by them to be necessarily deduced from those passages: and, secondly, as illustrative of the interpretation contended for in this work of the Creature-character of the Person of Jesus Christ.

2 Thes. i. 12. *Κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

English Version. "According to the grace of our God, and the Lord Jesus Christ."

With the exception of Bp. Middleton, who expresses some doubts on this passage, it is generally assumed by the advocates of the right use of the Definitive Article, that the rendering ought to be, "According to the grace of the God of us and Lord, Jesus Christ." Or, "According to the grace of our God and Lord, Jesus Christ." The propriety of this translation, as arising from a Canon founded on the usage of the Greek classics from the greatest antiquity, cannot be disputed, as far as the arrangement of the several words is concerned: but when the doctrine of the identity of Jesus Christ with Jehovah or the First Cause, is pronounced to be established by the text, it becomes necessary to examine into the ground of the assertion. It is certain that *θεος* is frequently a Proper Name, and does then mean Jehovah or the First Cause in the New Testament language, but it is as certain that *θεος* with *ημων* in construction, can be no more than an

Attributive Noun, declaring a character, office, relation, or dignity of him who is called Jesus Christ, and is so pronounced by them who advocate the Canon in question. Hurried on by an indiscreet zeal and imprudent haste to bring new proofs to a doctrine established on the prescription of ages, rather than on a calm and consistent inquiry into the sense of Holy Writ, these great men have disregarded their own Definition, and instead of searching for an appropriate rendering of *θεος* as an Attributive Noun with *ἡμῶν* in construction, they, in opposition to their better knowledge, have pronounced it to be a Proper Name, and, rendering it by the equivocal word GOD, have declared that Jesus Christ, who is by the text undoubtedly asserted to be *θεος*, is therefore Jehovah or the First Cause. It is to be lamented that they did not try how it would have read with their gloss on the word *θεος*, *e. g.* "According to the grace of our Jehovah and Lord, Jesus Christ." Or, "According to the grace of our First Cause and Lord, Jesus Christ." But "Great men are not *always* wise, neither do the aged *always* understand judgment." Let the sense of *θεος* in Matt. i. 23, as the rendering of *ἐν* in Emmanuel be given in this place, and it will run thus: "According to the grace of our Mediator and Lord, Jesus Christ"; and a doctrine which stands pre-eminently prominent in the Epistles of Paul will be seen: "For *there is one God* [Jehovah] and one Mediator between God [Jehovah] and men, the Man Christ Jesus."

2 Pet. i. 1. *Ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

English Version. "Through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

The error in this translation is obvious to every Greek scholar, and the propriety of the amendment proposed by the Writers already mentioned, as far as the arrangement of the words is concerned, must be acknowledged: viz. "Through the righteousness of Jesus Christ our God and Saviour." But their sense given to *θεος* with *ἡμῶν* in construction, is in-

admissible: viz. that he is Jehovah or the First Cause—
 “Through the righteousness of Jesus Christ our Jehovah and Saviour.” Let it be rendered in conformity with 2 Thess. i. 12, and Scripture will be made consistent with itself—
 “Through the righteousness of Jesus Christ our Mediator and Saviour,” and the contradiction to their own definition, viz. that *θεος* is an attributive noun and not a proper name, will be avoided.

Eph. v. 5. *Εν τη βασιλειᾳ του χριστου και θεου.*

English Version. “In the kingdom of Christ and of God.”

1 Tim. v. 31. *Διαμαρτυρομαι ενωπιον του θεου και κυριου Ιησου Χριστου.*

English Version. “I charge *thee* before God and the Lord Jesus Christ.”

2 Tim. iv. 1. *Διαμαρτυρομαι ουν εγω ενωπιον του θεου και κυριου Ιησου Χριστου.*

English Version. “I charge *thee* therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ.”

According to the amended translation required by the Article which is inserted before the first Attributive, and omitted before the second, Eph. v. 5, should read thus: “In the kingdom of him [being *or* who is] Christ and God.” 1 Tim. v. 21, “I charge *thee* before him [being *or* who is] God and Lord [viz.] Jesus Christ.” 2 Tim. iv. 1, “I charge *thee* therefore before him [being *or* who is] God and Lord [viz.] Jesus Christ”: but *θεος* being an Attributive Noun, according to the Canon, and not a Proper Name, it cannot in any of these instances mean Jehovah or the First Cause, but may have the signification of *θεος* in Matt. i. 23, and so may be read in the following manner: viz.

Eph. v. 5. “In the kingdom of him [being *or* who is] Anointed and Mediator.”

1 Tim. v. 21. “I charge *thee* before him [being *or* who is] Mediator and Lord, [viz.] Jesus Christ.”

2 Tim. iv. 1. “I charge *thee* therefore before him [being *or* who is] Mediator and Lord, [viz.] Jesus Christ.”

Great stress is laid on the words prefixed to the Attributive *Θεος* in the two following passages, as importing a peculiar exaltation of character in him who is so called. This very circumstance should have led to a suspicion that *Θεος* could not be intended to set forth the Most High, if it had not been determined to be an attributive noun and not a proper name by the Canon. Who can be greater than Jehovah? Who can be higher than the First Cause? Every epithet of comparative intensity must be vain when applied to Him, with whom nothing can be compared; but will become appropriate when prefixed to His name, whom men despise and reject, and before whom every Idol and Vanity is preferred.

Tit. ii. 13. *Επιφανειαν της δοξης του μεγαλου θεου και σωτηρος ημων Ιησου Χριστου.*

Jude iv. *Τον μονον δεσποτην θεον και κυριον ημων Ιησουν Χριστον αρνουντες.*

The rendering in the English Version of the first passage is contended to be faulty, viz.

“The glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ”: and that it ought to be,

“The glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ”: because, it is observed, *θεου* and *σωτηρος* must be understood of One Person. Be it so. But while *Θεος* has *ημων* in construction, it can be no other than an Attributive Noun, as *σωτηρος* undoubtedly is, and can never mean, as it is intended it should, Jehovah or the First Cause, viz. “The glorious appearing of our great Jehovah, *or* our great First Cause, and Saviour, Jesus Christ.” The English Version with a different and not unauthorized rendering of *θεου* will run thus—“The glorious appearing of the great Mediator and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” Or, according to the amended Version—“The glorious appearing of our great Mediator and Saviour Jesus Christ.” But, besides the objection that may be made to *θεου* as signifying Jehovah or the First Cause, it being only an Attributive Noun, it has escaped

the recollection of them who advocate the meaning of the word *θεου* to be Jehovah or The First Cause in this text, that they have formed their determination in direct opposition to the Scriptures themselves. We read "No man hath seen God [Jehovah] at any time." John i. 18. And again—"Whom no man hath seen nor can see." 1 Tim. vi. 16. How then can the Saints be "Looking for the glorious appearing of the great Jehovah"? Of course when Paul says "Looking for the glorious appearing, *or* Looking for the manifestation of the glory of the great *θεου*," he could not mean Jehovah, because, "No man hath seen him, nor can see him at any time," but must mean the future manifestation of "the great Mediator between God [Jehovah] and men, the Man Jesus Christ," who had appeared once in the fulness of the time. See 2 Tim. i. 10. Compare also 1 Tim. vi. 14—16. See page 112 for what has been advanced on this text.

With respect to the quotation from Jude iv. *θεου* is omitted on some great authorities. But supposing it to be a genuine reading, and the English Version right as far as the received sense of the words go, we are to read, "Denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." According to the amended rendering, it will be, "Denying our only Lord God and Lord, Jesus Christ." In this instance also *θεος* with *ημων* in construction will make it impossible that Jehovah or the First Cause can be intended, and another translation must be given to it. In agreement with the foregoing observations it may be rendered, "Denying our only Sovereign Mediator and Lord, Jesus Christ": but cannot without the greatest violence done to the idiom of the Greek tongue, according to the amendment proposed by the Canon, and the greatest outrage committed on the consistency of the Holy Scriptures, be translated, "Denying our only Sovereign Jehovah and Lord, *or* our only Sovereign First Cause and Lord Jesus Christ."

Under whatever aspect then the subject of the Incarnation of Jehovah is viewed, the Scriptures appear to furnish only one result, viz. that there is no foundation for the opinion which has been so long and so generally adopted, of One of the Trine-plurality in Jehovah having manifested himself in flesh assumed of the Virgin Mary, or according to the language of some, that the Divine Essence was corporified.

CHAPTER V.

AFTER a preparation so much but it is hoped not unprofitably protracted, it is intended to consider the terms "Son of God," &c. Previously to which it will be necessary to observe, that a due distinction is seldom made between the **Essence of Man**, or what he really is in himself, and the form under which he appears during the time of his sojourning on the earth. That they are both simultaneously manifested in this lower world, and seemingly from one common source, is certain, but their origin is as certainly from two different parents, as their **Beings** are of two opposite characters. The one spiritual, the other gross matter. This deriving its existence from its earthly mother, that from the Father of spirits. This to continue in being only till the great earthly purposes for which it was concentered in its mother's womb shall be accomplished, that to exist for ever in that far country which is hid from the eyes of all living. To a want of proper attention to these circumstances may be traced much of the obscurity in which the **Person** and the work of the **Son of God** are involved.

While the **Creature Man** is in this world, in the earthly house of this tabernacle, the object of love, hatred, or indifference to his fellows, no knowledge of his **Essence**, or that which constitutes **Humanity**, is to be obtained. The **Outward form**, which distinguishes him from every other being in the scale of **Entity**, and which is the mean of drawing forth the different feelings of them that behold it, occasionally indicates some of his emotions or designs, but can give no information concerning his **Essence**. The **Inward Man** is not

subject here to any intimate or direct observation. When he departs hence, leaving his tabernacle behind, he is alike hidden from the view of them with whom he had sojourned. Yet he is still the subject of their praise or condemnation, and his character and condition are spoken of with as much confidence as when he was with them, though it is impossible that he should in either state be the subject of their direct knowledge. He lived among them, but he was unseen. His Essence was unknown, yet it was discussed with the same positiveness, as if they had seen it with their eyes, had looked upon it, and their hands had handled it. When he is gone far from them, and from the possibility of any sense entering within the veil which separates him from them, they still speak of what he is with the same confidence and precision, as if they were present with him, enjoying an immediate contemplation, and having a full understanding of his spiritual character.

A due attention to these circumstances will shew how little the person of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as an inhabitant of a fleshy tabernacle, can be understood, if taken abstractedly from the habitation in which he was and is pleased still to dwell. To form any well grounded opinion of his proper character in the scale of Being, we must have recourse, not to the opposing sentiments of Fathers and Schoolmen drawn from the decisions of councils and synods, but to a consistent view of the Scriptures founded on an intimate knowledge of the original languages: to a view which reason can approve, and against which the determinations of common sense will not militate: to a view which the experience of every age has considered to be the only criterion by which a judgment can be made of the order of Being which inhabits any given form: to a view in a word which has Scripture to lead the way, and the unsophisticated determinations of reason to pronounce as accordant with supreme Wisdom to dictate, and the enlightened understanding of his creature Man to receive.

To shew the real character of the Saviour Jesus Christ, as it is made known to us from the terms "Son of God," &c. it

will be necessary to adduce some of the texts in which they occur, denoting the complex Man, or Man as he is seen and known in his component characters of the Inward and Outward Man. In this way his rank in the scale of Entity will stand manifest. And while it will, as it ever must, be impossible, while we are in the body, to understand what his Essence is, yet it will be evident that his Essence is not that of the Most High incarnate in human nature, but of a creature which has the pre-eminence in all things, an Inward Man or Soul in union with a Body, which is appropriate to and distinctive of the Human race alone.

First. The term "Son of God" is found in the following Scriptures to denote the person of the Saviour Jesus Christ in that which constitutes his Essence or real Humanity; *i. e.* in the Inward Man or Soul: a positive Entity possessed of an Individuality which was before all things, which had and has a pre-eminence in all things, which had God for its author, and which in the fulness of time took an Outward Man or Body to dwell in.

The term "Son of God" in this sense occurs not in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is found in the Chaldee of Daniel, iii. 25, בַּר אֱלֹהִים, where, from the context, as well as from the internal evidence which the word בַּר "Son" furnishes, it speaks of a Man in his Essential and Individual character, not announcing what that Essence is, but declaring only its state or condition, without affording the least ground for the generally received opinion, that it refers to the Divine Essence.*

* The subject does not permit any discussion on that Person in Jehovah, called Son in the Divine œconomy of redemption, as distinguished from that Individual of the human nature called Son of God. The author, however, holds that œconomy, as will be seen in its proper place, to be a fundamental position of the Old, as well as the corner stone of the New Testament. He asserts that unless the doctrine of a Trine-Plurality in which Jehovah has revealed himself, be made the leading feature of the believer's creed, he can have no accurate knowledge of his indefeasible right to the abounding mercies contained in that everlasting covenant, which is ordered in all things and sure. Jehovah One, which Jehovah is, may satisfy the Arian or Socinian, who would give an ac-

Dan. iii. 24, 25. "Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was astonished, and rose up in haste, and spake, and said unto his counsellors, Did not we cast three men נִבְרָץ bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O king. He answered and said, Lo, I see four men נִבְרָץ loose, and walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt, and the form of the fourth [Man] is like the Son of God."

It is not intended to discuss in this place how far the heathen were acquainted with that truth which the Church of God held more or less distinctly in every age, viz. the pre-existent person of the Saviour as a Man. The passage in Daniel is quoted to prove, that He who has at all times with the temptation made a way to escape, was present at this season also with Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, and was seen with them as a Man, and was called the Son of God. The word for Son בֶּן not בֵּן, both however denoting "a Son" in the Chaldee as well as Hebrew tongue,¹ tends to elucidate and confirm the point of his Pre-existence. בֶּן "a Son," "an Innocent," from בָּרַךְ to "cleanse, purify." בֵּן "a Son," from בָּנָה "to build up." A Son is he who is built up of his Parents, and who builds up his Father's house: for of old the genealogy of families was reckoned only in the Male line. But the Son of God in this Scripture is not בֶּן—בֵּן אֱלֹהִים "One built up" from pre-existent matter; but בֶּן "One pure, undefiled," who was brought into being by the immediate act of a holy God from a state of Non-entity: perfect in that one act, without any succession of acts by which his perfection was accomplished. This Son is mentioned once in the Psalms by the same appellation. "Kiss the Son." בֶּן, Ps. ii. 12. And in ver. 7, he is also termed by Jehovah בְּנִי "My Son,"

count of the hope that is in him: but Jehovah Aleim, *i. e.* Jehovah One in Essence, but Three in the divine œconomy of redemption, and with whom as such there are sure mercies and plenteous redemption, is absolutely necessary to the faith of the Christian, before he can hold fast the confidence of his hope firm unto the end.

i. e. "One built up" by him from pre-existent matter: viz. when he who was בר took flesh of the Virgin mother. To this incarnate state Daniel refers, when he says, ch. vii. 13, "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, *One* כְּבֹר like the Pure one, אֲנֹשׁ in his fallen state," or "in the likeness of sinful flesh," *i. e.* in the form or fashion which is inherited or taken from the first earthly man after the Fall, "came with the clouds of heaven," &c.

The word בר, though it does not in its radical sense, because that is impossible, assert an immediate production into being from a state of non-entity, yet it is obviously distinguished from בָּן which necessarily speaks of what was framed from pre-existent matter.

In the following New Testament Scriptures the Saviour Jesus Christ is set forth in the term "Son of God," $\delta \text{ υιος } \tau\omicron \varsigma \text{ } \theta\epsilon\omicron \varsigma$, υιος τῶ θεοῦ, or υιος θεοῦ, denoting a Creature-Essence possessed of an Individuality, termed also the Inward Man, or in modern language the Soul, who is the First-born of every creature, the Beginning of the Creation of God.

Matt. xxvii. 43. "He trusted in God, let him deliver him now if he will have him: for he said I am the Son of God."

The person, charged with saying he was the "Son of God," had his body, or the tabernacle in which he dwelt, fixed to a cross, and was tauntingly bid to come down from the Cross in that body. It was reproachfully urged against him that he trusted in God, and therefore was a distinct Individual Being from God, and God as One distinct from him was challenged to exert his power to deliver him. And why was Jesus thus dealt with? And why this challenge made to Jehovah? The High Priest, &c. entertained no doubt of the Humanity of Messiah when he should come, nor of Jehovah's justice in avenging any cruelty exercised upon him: but they thought it an incumbent duty according to their law, to see that judgment was executed on Jesus for asserting that he was that Pre-existent-Creature-Son, that long expected Prophet and

King, who was to come in the flesh to teach and to rule over Israel according to God's appointment. See Ch. VIII. under Mic. v. 2—5. And why did they reject his claim to this character? It was because he came not, as they desired, with temporal power, and with that grandeur of its display which had been manifested in past ages, as alluded to by Habakkuk in ch. iii. 13, compared with the preceding verses. The circumstance of not restoring the kingdom to them by the destruction of the Roman power, together with the meanness of his appearance and attendants, so unlike the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, and which he had manifested in his several appearances to their fathers, made them deny that he was that Christ, that Son of the living God, and urged them to treat him as an impostor, when he asserted that he was the pre-existent Lord, the Ruler "whose goings forth have been from the First time מִקֶּדֶם, from days of hidden time past מִיָּמֵי עוֹלָם": (See Mic. v. 1, in the Hebrew) and with whom (See Habak. iii. 13, in the Hebrew) Jehovah had gone forth in the days of their Fathers to discomfit their enemies. Jesus Christ will be found all that was then expected of him: but the High Priest, &c. knew not the Scriptures that he must first die and then rise again, before he should be revealed from heaven, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Matt. xxvii. 54. Now "when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and the things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God."

To the argument that might be drawn from the context, that Jesus, who said he was the Son of God, and was considered and spoken to by the High Priest, &c. as a Man, like themselves, subsisting of Soul and Body, that the offspring of God, and so the Son of God, this the substance of his Mother, and so the Son of Man, viz. "He trusted in God, let him deliver him now," it may be added, that he gave up

the ghost; and that his Body, which was secured in the sepulchre, rose again on the third day in union with the Soul that had been in Paradise, or the place of departed spirits. These circumstances are as striking proofs of an Incarnate Humanity, which in its fleshly substance, like every other Individual of the species, is capable of dying, and if God shall please of rising again, as of a spiritual Individual character which is distinct from God. But the parallel passages in Luke and Mark put the point in question beyond a doubt, if the words of Matthew could admit of any. "Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, certainly this was a righteous man," Luke xxiii. 47, whose Soul is now separated from his Body. "And when the centurion which stood over against him, saw that he cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man *ανδρωτος ουτος* was the Son of God," Mark xv. 39, who before his Incarnation was seen in the fire with Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, and now veiled in the flesh has given up the ghost.

Luke i. 35. "Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God."

Whence have the various false deductions which believers, and the multiplied filthy jests which infidel scoffers, have drawn from this portion of Scripture, arisen? Surely from an ignorance of the doctrine which stands prominent in both the Old and New Testament, viz. the Pre-existence of the Lord Jesus Christ as a Man. Let this passage and its context be considered with this clue. "And in the sixth month the Angel Gabriel was sent from God, unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David, and the virgin's name was Mary. And the Angel came in unto her, and said, Hail thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women. And when she saw him, she was troubled at his saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation it should be. And the Angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favour with God, [being the per-

son spoken of by the prophet Isaiah, "Behold, the *or* that Virgin *העלמה*, ἡ παρθένος, shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call his name Immanuel"] and behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He [this male conception] shall be great, and shall be called [*i. e.* shall be] the Son of the Highest [unlike any former and every future conception of women, he shall not be of Man, but of God,] and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. Then said Mary to the Angel, how shall this be [that I a Virgin should conceive and bring forth a Son] seeing I know not a man [a husband.—See John iv. 16, 18.] And the Angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, even [*καὶ* is so rendered in Luke xix. 42. Rom. viii. 23. 1 Cor. xv. 24. 2 Cor. i. 3.] the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee [the way of God's dealings on this occasion, however extraordinary, is not beyond man's understanding, or incapable of explanation. See Note below under Rom. viii. 32.] and that Holy thing [Holy one] which is being brought forth of thee shall be called [*i. e.* shall be] also the Son of God." Great stress is laid on the inferential *διο*, "therefore," to prove the disputed point of Jehovah's Incarnation: and it is urged that because the Holy Ghost should come, &c. therefore the appellation of Son of God should be given to what was conceived in and brought forth of the Virgin. In this case what becomes of *καὶ*, "also"? It has clearly no antecedent object to which it refers. Constantine, in his Lexicon, gives *διο καὶ* as occurring in Plato de leg., and renders it *atque etiam*, "and also." Let the well known Hebraism "shall be called," which is equivalent to "shall be," be considered, and the whole will run thus: "The Angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, even the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: and that Holy One which is being brought forth, *το γεννωμενον αγιον*, of thee shall be also

the Son of God," i. e. Besides the body which will be formed in thee and of thy substance, there will be a spiritual substance or the Inward Man that will dwell in it, which is the "Son of God," "the First-born of every creature," whom the nations of the earth, as well as the seed of Abraham, are anxiously expecting to see manifested in the flesh. A favourer of the Papal heresy may infer from the words, "Whence is to me, that the Mother of my Lord should come to me?" that the Virgin was the Mother of God, or Jehovah, (See Ch. VII. under Luke i. 31, 42, 43.) but can any Protestant concur in an inference, to which common sense refuses its assent, and the equivocal word *Κυριος*, "Lord,"* gives no countenance? Or can a version of the text under consideration be vindicated by a Protestant Church, which confirms the Popish blasphemy of a woman being the mother of Jehovah; which she must be, if that, which was conceived in her womb and issued from it, was an Incarnation of Jehovah?

Luke xxii. 70. "Then said they all, Art thou the Son of God?"

The context attentively considered, is, as in former instances, calculated to remove whatever doubts any pre-conceived opinion, formed from early instruction, may have instilled on this point. The person whom "the elders of the people, the chief priests, and the scribes" addressed, had been "taken," "held," "mocked," "smitten," by their agents. They questioned him, saying, "Art thou the Son of God?" referring to an existence before his manifestation in the flesh, and not only to a pre-existence, but to his pre-existence as that of a peculiar person. "Art thou that Son *ὁ υἱος* of God," called Messiah by the prophets? and of course as Messiah a Creature also.† He denied not, but confessed

* For the impossibility of the word "Lord" having any reference to Jehovah, in consequence of its connection with the possessive "My," see p. 54, under John xx. 28.

† Messiah is the title of the Deliverer expected by the Jews, who, when he should be manifested in the flesh, was to be like Moses in all things,

that he was "that Son of God": a confession which they laid to his charge as blasphemy as soon as he had made it. And they concluded that his guilt was established in his making a confession of it. "What need we any further witness: for we ourselves have heard of his own mouth?" But the question, Of what nature was the blasphemy? requires a fuller explanation. The whole nation was looking for him of whom all the prophets spake, Messiah, the Prince, that pre-existent Lord, that Son of the living God, who had gone before their fathers in the wilderness, (See Habak. iii. 13.) to come and reign over them in great pomp and power in the flesh. "Art thou the Christ?" had been previously asked. His low estate, his mean attire and companions, had made them determine he had no title to this glorious character: and his voluntary confession, that he laid claim to it, urged them to carry him immediately before the governor. "The whole multitude of them arose, and led him to Pilate, convinced that they had evidence sufficient to convict him of being an impostor: and an impostor who not only wished to deceive the people, but who was guilty of sedition in saying, that himself was Christ, a king.* Pilate's words confirm the

and to whom they were to hearken, or be cut off from the people of God. משיח, Χριστος, *Anointed*, is a name that refers to the three great offices of King, Prophet, Priest, which the Saviour was to fill. It denotes a person who has received gifts, graces, perfections, and a dignity, which he did not possess of himself, and must therefore have relation to a Creature. It can have none to Jehovah, as the signification of the term proves, and the following Scriptures confirm. "The rulers take counsel against Jehovah, and against his Messiah משיחו." Ps. ii. 2. "Thou [Jehovah] wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, *even* for salvation with thy Messiah משיחך." Hab. iii. 13. "He said unto them, But whom say ye that I am? Peter answering said, The Christ of God." Luke ix. 20. "Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom," &c. 1 Cor. i. 30. "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's," 1 Cor. iii. 23. "The head of every man is Christ, and the head of Christ is God." 1 Cor. xi. 3.

* The writings of all the Evangelists bear full testimony to the nature of the blasphemy of which Jesus was supposed to be convicted, viz. the assuming presumptuously the character of the Incarnate Messiah, which

whole view here taken, when he said unto the chief priests and rulers, "Ye have brought this man unto me, as one that perverteth the people: and behold I having examined him before you, have found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse him." The claim of Royalty on the part of Jesus was confessed in the hearing of Pilate, to whom, when he asked, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" Jesus answered and said, "Thou sayest it": yet immediately "Pilate said to the chief priests and to the people, I find no fault in this man." He had learned from Jesus in their presence, that his kingdom was not of this world, but was to be set up in the hearts of those men over whom he ruled. To testify of this truth was the end for which he the Pre-existent Man was Incarnate, or came into the world. John i. 30. How strong a confirmation does every part of the affecting history bring, that it is a Man, an Incarnate Individual of the human race, of whom the whole is spoken! Not more strong indeed than the testimony which every succeeding age has given, that the world will not have this Man, the "One chosen out of the people" "from the beginning," in the cha-

title was coupled here with the Son of God, (See verses 67, 70.) as in Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." "The High Priest and all the council sought false witness against him, but found none." "Many bare false witness against him, but their witness agreed not together." The first three gospels expressly inform us that the condemnation passed upon Jesus was founded upon his declaration that he was the Christ, the Son of God, or the Son of the Blessed. "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God." Could language more explicit be used to shew the distinct Individual character or Being of the "Son of God" from "the living God"? "Jesus saith unto him, thou hast said. Then the High Priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy, what farther need have we of witnesses? Behold now ye have heard his blasphemy": viz. of calling himself the Christ, an highly exalted Creature indeed, but as Christ still a Creature, and so making himself the Son of God. This also was laid to his charge when he was fixed to the Cross. "Prophecy to us thou Christ, who smote thee." Let him save himself if he be the Christ, the chosen of God." "If thou be Christ, save thyself and us." "Let Christ the King of Israel descend now from the Cross, that we may see and believe."

acter of the second Adam, or the earthly house of that tabernacle which like the first Adam was formed by the immediate power of Jehovah, the Lord from heaven, the King of saints, to reign over it.

John. i. 34. "And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God."

Who this was that John the Baptist declared to be the Son of God will be collected from the context. We there learn that it was Jesus who had a pre-existent state and that a creature-state, and whose leading character, when made "manifest to Israel," he sets forth as "the Lamb of God": directing the attention of those who then saw him in the flesh, and of all who have since heard the glad tidings of his salvation, to the person of the Man who was to bear the sin of the world in his own body when hanging on the tree. But he not only describes him in express terms as a Man of superior excellence for the work which he should accomplish in his earthly house or tabernacle, and so be preferred before him in that respect, but as One who in the Inward Man existed before him. "This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a Man *αὐτῷ* which is preferred before me: for he [*αὐτῷ* a Man] was before me." The historical fact, that the birth or manifestation of John Baptist in the flesh preceded that of our Lord, is beyond all doubt: and the testimony of the Apostle, who has recorded the words of the Baptist in relation to the person and character of Jesus, has never been impeached. What other conclusion then can be drawn, but that Jesus as a Man had an existence before he was manifested in the flesh? "He that cometh after me is preferred before me," verse 15; "After me cometh a Man, which is preferred before me, for he was before me," verse 30. How wonderfully the golden chain of evidence on this point runs through the sacred Volume, uniting and confirming every part! Messiah was to be, when "made manifest to Israel," "the seed of the woman": "a prophet like unto Moses": "a child born": "a rod out of the stem of Jesse": "whose visage was marred more than any man":

"born in Bethlehem Ephratah": "The Man whose name was the Branch": who should come "lowly and riding upon an ass." And this very Man "of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph," "as was supposed," Nathaniel declares to be the Incarnation of the Son of God, the King of Israel: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel": and of whom Andrew said, "We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, The Christ."

John ix. 35. "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?"

The man that was born blind, and healed by the power of Jesus, being asked by his neighbours, "How were thine eyes opened, answered and said, a Man that is called Jesus made clay," &c. The Pharisees, to whose questions he had made a similar reply, said, "This Man is not of God, because he keepeth not the sabbath-day." "We know this man is a sinner." "How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles?" was the reply of him who was born blind. And when he was cast out of the synagogue for persevering to give the glory of his cure to the Son of Mary, for he had no further knowledge of his person, Jesus having found him, said unto him, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that [in the flesh] talketh with thee." Can evidence more decisive be afforded, that by the expression "Son of God," the Saviour, Messiah, the exalted Pre-existent Creature as Incarnate, an Individual of mankind, in his complex character of the Inward and Outward Man, of whom Martha said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world," (Compare chapter ix. 22.) is intended: or the persons by whom that evidence is given, considered in every point of view, be more unexceptionable? He that was healed knew that Messiah was expected soon to be manifested in the flesh: he believed in him as so manifested to be the great prophet (Comp. ver. 17, 22.) whom many kings

had desired to see, and to whom many women had desired to give birth : but he knew not that he was already come on the earth, or had not yet been favoured with a knowledge of his person. "Who is he, Lord, that I might," now that I have eyes to see the manifestation of this wondrous Man, (Comp. Judg. xiii. 6, with verse 33 of this chapter) seek him out, and having found him, "believe on him." "Jesus said unto him, Thou hast already seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee."

John xi. 27. "She saith unto him, yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world."

The multiplied and concurrent testimonies contained in this chapter of Jesus as a distinct Individual of the human race, in connection with his giving to himself and receiving from one of Lazarus' sisters the appellation of "Son of God," in the view already taken, would be sufficient to put the matter beyond a doubt, if there were no other Scriptures to corroborate them. "Jesus said, this sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby": thus claiming the title of "Son of God." When he was about to go into Judea, his disciples attempted to dissuade him, by reminding him that "the Jews of late sought to stone" him. His reply was in confirmation of his personal character as "Son of Man." "If any man walk in the day he stumbleth not," &c. Again when he saw Mary "weeping, and the Jews also weeping that came with her, he groaned in the spirit and was troubled—And wept," testifying that he was in all things made like unto his brethren, and was troubled with a feeling of our infirmities. Some of the Jews also, upon witnessing the affection which he bare to Lazarus, "said, Could not this Man οὗτος which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even this Man οὗτος should not have died." The chief priests and the pharisees likewise add their testimony. "This Man οὗτος ὁ ἀνθρώπος doeth many miracles. If we let him alone, all will believe on

him": i. e. "This Man," as the Incarnate Messiah. Comp. chap. ix. 27. An unexceptionable testimony this, that they believed that the Messiah, when he should come, would be a Man like unto themselves: a truth which John Baptist had before declared in his confession, chap. i. 20. And Mary, immediately after her declaration that Jesus was Messiah, the Son of God, expressly announces what her opinion of him in that character was, in saying, "The Master is come, and calleth for thee": appropriating, as the murderers of the Lord of life and glory did in other places, the appellations "Son of God" and "Son of Man" to the person of Jesus of Nazareth. But this was not the whole of the testimony borne by Mary the sister of Lazarus, and assumed by Jesus as belonging to himself. She added, "Which should come into the world." And our Lord at the grave "lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me, and I know that thou hearest me always: but because of the people that stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." Whoever is sent must have had a previous existence, for it is impossible to send what is not. But Jesus who speaks and is spoken of, is a Man. Therefore this Man Jesus had an existence before he came forth from the Father. So plainly is this two-fold truth here recorded: viz. that the term "Son of God" means the Humanity, and that he, to whom that title was given, existed before he came into this world in that body which was prepared for him.

Rom. i. 1, 3, 4. "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead."

"The Apostle introduced this Epistle by proclaiming himself to be its author. He declares whose servant he was, what was the nature of his office, and what the message he came to deliver. Being born a subject of the God of this

world, he had been made a servant of Jesus Christ. After living long a persecutor of his people, he was sent to make known his name and salvation. Like the priests and Levites under the law, he was separated from his brethren the children of Israel, to preach the gospel of God concerning his Son Jesus Christ. These glad tidings were, that Jesus Christ, the Saviour, who was the Son of God, was made* of the seed of David according to the flesh. This is no obscure intimation that he existed before his Incarnation: and his Incarnation, inasmuch as he was of the seed of David, is a positive proof of his Individual character as a Man, like his forefathers in the flesh, to the exclusion of the idea of his having or being a Human Nature void of Personality. This same Jesus Christ made Lord or Ruler of all things, having emptied himself of the glory, a Creature-glory, (See Ch. VIII. under John xvii. 4, &c.) which he had with the Father before the world was, and being found in fashion as a Man, or clothed with a material earthly body which was prepared for him, after enduring the pain and suffering the shame of the Cross in that body, he rose with it from the dead on the third day, and by this resurrection was declared to be the Son of God with power, the first-born of every creature, who was in all things to have the

* The Son of God, who ever he was, could not be literally made of the seed of David, for he had a previous, positive, and perfect Entity of his own. But, having before a complete Existence, he was from the seed of David, (*γενόμενον εκ σπέρματος Δαβίδ, was being from the seed of David*) i. e. took upon him flesh from the Line or posterity of David. An Incarnation could add no more to the perfection of the Son of God, the first-born of every creature, than to Jehovah himself. The words "was made" express more than the original warrants in this place, and in the parallel passage, Gal. iv. 4, "God sent his Son made of a woman [*γενόμενον εκ γυναικος, who was being from a woman*] made under the law." *γενόμενον υπο νομον, who was being under the law.*] Also in John i. 14, "And the word was made flesh, [*σὰρξ ἐγένετο, was being flesh*, in addition to what he was before] and dwelt among us, and we beheld," &c. To effect which it was necessary he should be clothed with flesh. And in Acts xxvi. 28, "Almost thou persuadest me TO BE a Christian *Χριστιανὸν γίνεσθαι*, i. e. in addition to a believer in the prophets as speaking of Christ, a believer also in Jesus as the Christ of God.

pre-eminence. "I lay down my life [*ψυχὴν bodily life*] that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This command have I received of my Father."

1 John iii. 8. "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

The several circumstances which belong to the manifestation of the great destroyer of the adversary of God and of the Redeemed, are decisive and declaratory of his rank and character. The context states that at his first coming "the world knew him not," that when he shall appear a second time "we shall be like him," and that "he was manifested to take away our sins." What Son can this be to whose image we are predestinated to be conformed, but he who was the First-born among many brethren, and therefore could not be Deity? What Son was that who was manifested in the flesh, but Emmanuel, *עִם נוֹאֵל*, the one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus? What Son whom the world knew not, but he whom John declares was "from the beginning," and whom when manifested to the world in the flesh to destroy the works of the devil, the Apostles "heard," "saw with their eyes," "looked upon," and their "hands handled"? Language can hardly be more definite in describing an Individual of the common Essence or original being, and Nature or birth in the flesh, which exists between the Redeemer and his redeemed; nor can it be more explicit in announcing that he had an existence before he was manifested to the world, who, because "the children are partakers of flesh and blood,* also

* If any confirmation were necessary to establish the reader in the Bible truth asserted in 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3; 2 Pet. i. 13, 14, the present might be added from Heb. ii. 14, to prove that "flesh and blood," or the "earthly house of this tabernacle," is no more than an adjunct to the real Man. "Because the children, *κεκοινωνηται σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος*, had flesh and blood as a clothing common" to them all, so Christ *παρα πλεονως* "in a manner absolutely the same," *μετεσχεν*, "was a partaker," or "had in common" with them flesh and blood, that by the death of that

himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." He was that "One chosen out of the people" on whom God had laid help, because he was mighty to save; and when the fulness of the time was come, sent forth, being of a woman, being under the law.*

What a cloud of witnesses do these and other Scriptures, where the same expression "Son of God" occurs, bring of the truth of the point under discussion, viz. that it is not Jehovah, as One in the Trine-Plurality, which is intended, but that the Saviour, as a Man, an Individual of the human race alone is to be understood by it. Zeal for the honour of Jehovah Aleim appears to have prevented the acknowledgment of the Pre-existent glory of the Redeemer as a Man, but it is a zeal unconnected with a knowledge of his way from the beginning, and of Him who is The Way and The Beginning. At no period of the Church's existence did the followers of

body which he took "he might destroy him that had the power of death." Both the Head and the Members, the Father and the Children—"Behold I and the children which God hath given me"—had an antecedent existence to their investment with flesh and blood. But these were Incarnate and in that state destroyed themselves, it became necessary that He should be made like unto them in being Incarnate also, that the Prince of Darkness should be foiled by the use of the same instrument by which he had introduced sin, and hoped to establish its perpetual dominion over the sons of Adam.

* The advocates for the widely extended doctrine of Jehovah's Incarnation seem to disregard the instruction which the page of history furnishes. It informs us that the Anthropomorphites, a sect in the Second Century, revived in the year 939, held, that the Deity was clothed with a human form. Mosheim's account of this heresy is as follows. "There were yet subsisting some remains of the Arians in several parts of Italy, and particularly in the territory of Padua. But Ratherius, bishop of Verona, had a still more enormous heresy to combat in the system of the Anthropomorphites, which was revived in the year 939. In the district of Vicenza, a considerable number, not only of the illiterate multitude, but also of the sacerdotal order, fell into that most absurd and extravagant notion, that the Deity was clothed with a human form, and seated like an earthly monarch upon a throne of gold," &c. Ecclesiastical History, cent. x. p. ii. c. v. § iv.

the Lamb shun to declare all the counsel of God, as far as the Spirit was graciously pleased to reveal it. And now that the same Spirit is causing knowledge to increase in a degree unknown to many past ages, it is an imperative duty in every one who has reason to think he is taught of God, to withhold no part of the truth which he has learned from the children of the kingdom, but to be valiant for it; seeking only the testimony of a good conscience, while he is endeavouring to promote a more extensive diffusion of the glories of Jehovah and his Son Jesus.

Besides the term "Son of God," which has been shewn to denote the Lord's Christ as the First-born of every creature, the pre-existent Man, before his Incarnation, in opposition to the commonly received opinion that it is intended to express the Godhead or Jehovah who took flesh, the term "Son" is also used in construction with the possessive pronoun "His." The attention of the reader is requested to the following instances in which the words occur, for the purpose of determining whether they furnish any matter capable of invalidating the arguments already adduced on the subject now before him.

John iii. 16, 17. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved."

Mankind, not excepting that part which is most habituated to close thinking, are so much accustomed to rest upon the opinions which they formed at an early period of life, or are daily receiving from their fellow students, without bringing them to the test of Bible consistency, that the most obvious truths pass by them unheeded: and when they are forced upon their attention, the inveteracy of errors long adopted and cherished prevents the reception of these truths, though their propriety is readily acknowledged, and their beauty stands confessed. *E. G.* No man is unwilling to admit that what he

gives to another must be, before as well as after he alienates it, something extraneous or beside himself. It matters not whether it is certain or uncertain that it will return to him again, the act of making it over to another puts it beyond a doubt, that it is something which is neither himself *in toto* nor any constituent part of himself, if after having imparted his gift he is the same entire and perfect Individual. So also in the instance of a man's sending any one to make known his will or designs, or to be the instrument of dispensing his bounty, it is equally evident, that he who is sent is not only distinct but separate from him whose messenger he is, or from whom he comes. A legate of this kind would not be required before he declared his commission, even to intimate that he was in the place or stead of another whose message he bore, and was not the same in Essence and Individuality with him who sent him. Self-evident as all this is in earthly matters, and it is incontestibly certain that heavenly things are to be learned only through earthly, it passes for nothing in things that accompany salvation. If it be said, "I gave my only begotten Son," "I sent not my Son," no one will for a moment suppose, that he is expected to believe, that the Individual Essence of him who gives or sends is intended to be spoken of in respect to what he gives or sends; or that it is intended to say, that he gives himself or sends not himself. The reason that the contrary passes so current for a revelation of the Most High is, that Christians have agreed to surrender the use of all their outward senses, and the determinations of their inward spirit, as it is influenced by the report which those senses make of external objects, to the decisions of men, who have formed their Creed without a due knowledge of the original Scriptures, and without any regard to consistency in relation to the evidence of their senses, or the right application of words with which they are well acquainted.

Let the words "gave" and "sent" be attended to, and the Scripture under consideration cannot be said to have reference to God as God, but to what God has done by another,

even by his Son Jesus, who was with God in the beginning, who was the Beginning, the First-born of every creature, and who in due time was Incarnate and dwelt among us. "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth [this] his Son, being of a woman, being under the law, to redeem them that were under the law."

Rom. viii. 3, 29. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin [*Margin* by a sacrifice for sin] condemned sin in the flesh. For whom he did fore-know he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren."

The distinction between God and this his Son is kept up most strikingly in the fifth chapter, verses 1, 11, 15: *e.g.* "We have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "We joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ." "The grace of God and the gift by grace, which is by One Man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." That Some One beside Deity is here intended is evident, but that That Some One is a human nature, devoid of Personality, if such a thing be possible,* cannot attach in these places any more than in chapter viii. 3, where God's Son is said to be sent "in the likeness of sinful flesh." And notwithstanding the currency of such an idea among those who love the Lord Jesus in truth and sincerity, may it not be truly affirmed that it excludes all soberness of thought as well as of expression. Neither can it be inferred from ch. viii. 3, that God's own Son is any other than that glorious creature who had the pre-eminence over all that the Mundane system did or ever will contain:

* Human Nature is but an abstract notion; it cannot be separated from Individuality, for Human Nature exists in Individuals, *i.e.* in separate existencies, each of which has a numerical Oneness. Human Nature as a General is a mere notion of the mind, which arises from a comparison of One Man's Nature or Essence with another. Let it be contemplated in Particulars, and we may arrive at some knowledge of its origin and destination.

a manifest distinction in Essence between them being evident from the language employed. This his own *εαυτς* Son was sent, and when manifested in the likeness of sinful flesh, is said to have that tabernacle of flesh delivered up into wicked hands, and by them smitten, and made a sacrifice for sin. The term *εαυτς*, from *ε*, *se*, and *αυτος*, *ipse*, *himself*, implies a peculiarity of character and not an identity of Essence, and therefore cannot prove him to be of the Substance, or Essence of the Father. *Εαυτς υιος* “the Son of Himself,” one who was brought into existence before the foundation of the world by His immediate act without any instrument, and so the Son of no one else. Of what Essence he was is declared in v. 29, where this “his Son” is said to be “the first-born among many brethren”: confirming the parallel passages in Col. i. 15, 17, “Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature”—“And he is before all things”—as well as the fact that he had not a common Essence with God or Jehovah, but was possessed of a Creature-Essence, and had a common Essence with, and was an Individual of the Human race, having a Personality like unto the brethren, only when Incarnate without the actual commission of sin, either in Body or Soul.

Gal. iv. 4—6. “But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.”

The Individual as well as Creature-character of “his Son” whom God promised to send forth from himself from heaven, to dwell in the flesh among the creatures he had formed, and in the flesh to preach the Gospel of his kingdom to his redeemed, is placed beyond a doubt in this part of the volume of the Book. It was of this Son, before his Incarnation, that it was said, “Out of Bethlehem Ephratah shall he come forth unto me, whose goings forth have been from the First time *מקדם*, from the days of hidden time past *מימי עולם*, See p. 54. It was of this Son when Incarnate, not as Deity without be-

ginning, but as a Creature who was "In the beginning," who "is before all things," who was "the Beginning of the creation of God," it is said, that "when the fulness of the time was come, God sent him forth, being [in addition to what he was before] of a woman, being [originally the Lawgiver, then] under the Law, to redeem them that were under [the curse of] the Law, that they might receive the adoption of sons." To these things the joint testimony of the prophets is directed, and this is the purport of the record made in the Epistle to the Church of Galatia. The united testimony of these servants of the Most High therefore prove the Creature-pre-existence of the Son of God, and that God did manifest this his Creature-Son to the world in the flesh, to redeem "in the body of his flesh" "them that were under the law" from the curse of the law, by being made a curse for them.

Col. i. 12, 13, 15. "Giving thanks unto the Father—who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son—who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature."

Here, as throughout the Sacred Volume, God is distinguished from his Son Jesus by such descriptive marks, as make it necessary to forego the use of our senses, or to approve such abuse of our understanding as is equivalent to it, before we can make the Son to be One in Essence or Individuality with the Father. This Epistle begins with "Grace be unto you and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ." It proceeds with Giving thanks unto the Father for deliverance from the power of darkness, and translation into the kingdom of his dear Son, who is declared to be "the Image of the Invisible God, the first-born of every creature." Can God in these Scriptures be said to be identified in Essence with his dear Son? Can an Image be the thing represented? Can a creature be the First-Cause? Do not these Scriptures rather speak of him, who "in the beginning was with God," "*as* one brought up *with him*," who "was daily *his* delight, rejoicing always before him," the In-

ward Man or Soul of him who afterwards "was being flesh, and dwelt among us"?

After the foregoing observations on the term "His Son," it is unnecessary to do more than leave the Scriptures already adduced in relation to that and the term "Son of God," with some few others unnoticed, to the reader's discrimination, to determine, whether the idea of Deity in the Son can with any consistency be inferred from them, or whether any thing else is intended by them than a confirmation of that Scriptural truth, that the Son of whom they testify is the Inward Man of the Saviour Jesus Christ.

The word "Son" with the addition of "The" occurs also not unfrequently in the New Testament Scriptures, and relates only to Messiah as a Man.

The following are instances.

Matt. xi. 25, 27. "At that time Jesus answered and said— All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father, save The Son, and *he* to whomsoever the Son will reveal *him*."

The time when Jesus spake these words was, when John who was in prison had sent two of his disciples and said unto him, "Art thou he that should come," viz. The Son of God who was seen of Nebuchadnezzar in the midst of the fire, and of whose majesty Peter, James and John, were afterwards eye-witnesses in the holy mount "or do we look for another"? Jesus, the Son of the Father, who was the person sought for as manifested in the flesh, describes himself as the "Son of Man," one pronounced by his enemies to be "a Man, gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." And then confirms the Creature-character of himself who had become the Son of Man, by professing that of himself, though he was that "Wisdom" who was "set up from hidden time past מֵעוֹלָם, from the beginning, before ever the earth was"; (Compare Matt. xi. 19, Luke vii. 35, with Prov. viii. 23) he had nothing. "All things are delivered unto me of my

Father." This he did also more explicitly after the resurrection. "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain, where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him they worshipped * him: but some doubted.

* It will be objected that the word προσκυνῶσαν "they worshipped" overthrows the argument, and proves the Deity of Him who is called "The Son." There is no greater obstacle to the progress of truth than the determination, so common among the Learned, of affixing their own meaning to words, and pronouncing their inferences drawn from them to be incontrovertible. Among many others, those words, which in the Hebrew and Greek as well as in the English language, denote respect paid to dignity or pre-eminence, excellence or worth, have been subjected to this treatment, and sentiments have been established in relation to persons and acts which have no legitimate foundation. It is impossible to say in what Hebrew term the Apostle thought when he wrote the word προσκυνῶσαν "they worshipped" in this place, whether it was כָּנָה or הִשְׁתַּחוּת. But as Hebrew was the vernacular tongue of the Apostle and his countrymen in those days, (See Note p. 111.) there can be no doubt but his ideas were drawn from that language. If the Hebrew term was כָּנָה it will be considered no more than a gratuitous assertion to say, that something beyond or exceeding humanity was contemplated by the disciples, *e.g.* "Nebuchadnezzar fell down on his face and worshipped כָּנָה Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odours unto him," Dan. ii. 46. This is further evident from the context. "The king answered unto Daniel and said, Of a truth *it is* that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings. Then the king made Daniel a great man," &c. v. 47, 48. He pronounced him to be a Man, and yet paid him the honour conveyed in the word כָּנָה. He declared him to be high in honour with the God of his people, and proceeded to advance him in dignity among the princes of the Babylonish Empire. With respect to כָּנָה the outward act implied by it is the same, whatever is the character of the Person before whom and to whom the act is performed. That the mind will be more deeply impressed in proportion to the sense of the obligations conferred, or that the inward sense of the mind will vary according to the power and authority of the Person to whom respect is paid, will be granted, but it will be in vain contended, that this or that peculiar sense, or this or that peculiar honour, is explicitly denoted by the outward act. All external acts of Worship are equivocal, and cannot determine either the intended homage or the internal feelings of the worshipper. The mind or inward thought, and not the bodily gesture, makes the distinction. כָּנָה, in the Hebrew and Chaldee languages, means to "bow down." And προσκυνῶσαν from προσ and κύνω to "crouch" as a dog at his Master's feet, has evidently the same signification. Both express a *sensu*

And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." In perfect agreement with this receiving of power as a creature of God from God's hand, John writes, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath

of humility and thankfulness, and both are equally applicable to any object to which civil reverence or religious worship is intended to be paid, but from neither of them can the inward sense of the mind, or the quality of the object to which the respect is paid, be inferred. But granting that it is the inward sense of the mind, and not the bodily posture, which marks the nature of the Worship, yet if the inward feeling should be that of religious reverence, it will be asked, can such worship be paid to any but Deity without incurring the charge of Idolatry? If it cannot, the Apostle John was an idolater of no common character. After being long confirmed in his holy office, he offered to an Angel religious worship, which it is contended belongs to Jehovah alone, and this not once only, but repeated it after he had been warned of the Angel. Now whom did the Apostle consider the Angel to be, a creature or Deity? If a creature, then religious worship may be given to another than the First Cause, and the inward sense of the mind alone can determine the different degree of religious feeling experienced in paying homage to an Angel and the Most High God. Whom also did Cornelius take Peter to be, when he fell down at his feet and worshipped him? If Deity, would Peter have expressed no more surprise or resentment than calmly to say, "Stand up, I also am a Man"? Would not his naturally quick feeling have been raised to as high a pitch of indignation as Paul and Silas exhibited, who "rent their clothes," &c. when religious worship of an unsuitable character was offered to them? If the Apostle's thoughts were directed to השתחוה, the same result will follow. שח in Hithpael expresses an act of men as well as of other creatures to God, or what is set up and accounted as God, Ps. xcv. 6—xcvii. 7. Is. xlv. 17.—of man toward man, Gen. xxiii. 7, 1 Chron. xxix. 20.—of inanimate things toward God, Nehem. ix. 6. The term שח denotes a certain defined outward act, whatever the peculiar inward feelings may be, and is the same to every object to which it is directed, and therefore whatever the peculiar sentiments of the mind may be, that outward act cannot denote the quality of the object to which it is directed. שח in Hithpael, which the LXX. render by προσκυνω, is to "bow oneself," and שח thus employed to decide the force of προσκυνωσαν in the place under consideration, can prove no more than that respect is paid to acknowledged dignity or pre-eminence, excellence or worth, without defining the degree of eminence possessed by the Person to whom it is directed.

To the above remarks the following quotations may be added, which will help to put the matter beyond doubt, that the posture or attitude

given all things into his hand." "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and was going *υπαγει* to God," saith, "Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may

alone of the person who pays respect is intended by the word *προσκυνω*, and not the peculiar dignity of him to whom that respect is paid, or the peculiar affection or feeling of the mind of the person who pays the respect. For though in each quotation *προσκυνω* is a term expressive of respect, yet the person to whom it is applied is not always the same in character or dignity, and consequently the affection of the mind of the person paying the respect must have a corresponding variation, while the posture or attitude of the person is the same. Or, in other words, it may be said, that *προσκυνω* denotes simply a specific posture or attitude of the body intended to shew respect, of whatever kind that respect may be according to the inward feeling of the mind of him who pays it, or to whatever rank or character it may be that it is paid.

The LXX. version of Gen. xliii. 26, where the respect paid by Jacob's sons to their brother Joseph in the land of Egypt is mentioned, gives the sense of the original לִי יִשְׁתַּחוּ by *και προσκυνησαν αυτω*—"And they bowed themselves to him." *English Version*. Josephus Antiq. B. vj. c. 13, speaking of Saul and David, writes, *επιστραφεντος δε του βασιλεως προσκυνειται αυτον*—"Upon this the king turning himself about, he [David] prostrated himself before him." Herodotus i. 134, speaking of the Persian customs when men met each other in public, says, *αν δε η ουτις υποδιαξερως, προσπιπτων προσκυνει τον ιτερον*—"If there should be another of much lower rank, falling down, he prostrates himself before him." Cornelius Nepos in vitâ Cononis, cap. iij. writes, *Necesse est enim, si in conspectum veneris, venerari te regem, quod προσκυνειν illi vocant*. "It is necessary if thou art introduced into the presence of the king, that thou pay him that honour, which they term *προσκυνειν*."

It remains to consider, and, if possible, to determine what sense the Reformers of our Church affixed to the term "Worship." It is used indiscriminately by them to express the affectionate respect which a man engages to pay to his wife, the honour he puts on the civil magistracy, and the high reverence he pays to God's dear Son as incarnate of the Virgin mother, as well as the most consummate prostration of heart, soul, and spirit, with which he looks up to the First Cause. The language of the Received Version therefore in this place cannot be adduced as decidedly subversive of the argument in question, but may be considered to refer here, as in the instances above alluded to, to such honour and respect as can be legitimately conferred by one creature upon another.

But to be able to appreciate with some degree of certainty the force of the word "Worship," as used by our Translators, it will be necessary to consider the places in which it is employed by them. Of one hundred

glorify thee : as thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him."

What else is portrayed here but a Creature, pre-eminent indeed in all things, but a Creature who had all things from the Father's bounty! The extensive powers with which The Son was endowed in his unembodied state as the Angel of Jehovah מלאך יהוה are not incompatible with his Human

and eighty-two instances in which it occurs, one hundred and four are found in the Old, and seventy-eight in the New Testament. The original word in the Old Testament is שָׁרָה, with the exception of Eleven instances, viz. ten in Daniel, where it is שָׁרָה, and one in Jeremiah, where it is עָרָה. The original word in the New Testament is προσκυνω, with the exception of seventeen instances, viz. ten, where it is σιβω, four λατρευω, one Σεραπειω, one Σεσκαυω, one πακορος. Now if שָׁרָה had never been rendered by any other English term than "Worship," we might from the prejudices which education has instilled in regard to that word, have been induced to infer, that it spoke only of an act of religious reverence of the profoundest nature, or which could be paid to the First Cause alone. But as it has other and very different senses attributed to it by our Translators, we are led from their authority, which is the point now contended for, to pronounce that such is not necessarily the case here: and that though they seem occasionally to assign to it a sense of religious reverence of a very high character, yet being used by them in an inferior sense (See Luke xiv. 10, where we read "Then shalt thou have worship in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee.") their design might be also the same in the place before us. And if we consider the meaning which the term "Worship" once had, for "Worship" is a Saxon word signifying the acknowledgment of worth, dignity, excellence, pre-eminence; and "to worship" is therefore to attribute worth, &c.* and which meaning does not appear to have been lost in their day, we shall be disposed to acquit them altogether of contradiction on this point, and to attribute what seems to favour that idea to the circumstance of our confounding their sentiments with those of men of more modern times, by whom the signification of the term "Worship" has been wholly changed.

* Junius in his *Etymologicum Anglicanum*, Edit. 1743, has the following remarks on the word Worship under SHIP.—"SHIP is the termination of Substantives denoting an Office or Employment. *Stewardship*, the office of a Steward, from the Anglo-Saxon *ſcēp* or *ſcūp*, words of the same force. *peopſcēpe* Dignity. *pepſcēpe* The Dignity of a Lord." In conformity with which we have Luke xiv. 10, rendered as above.

character before incarnation, any more than the equally extensive powers which he now possesses in his embodied glorified state either do, or are supposed by any to, extinguish the Humanity, which is now ascended where it was before it came down from heaven.

Matt. xvi. 16. "And Simon Peter answered and said, **Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.**"

John vi. 69. "And we believe, and are sure, that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God."

John xi. 27. "She saith unto him, Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world."

If the expression "The Christ," as designating the same person as "The Son," alone were considered, it might be confidently asserted, that a Creature, a Man, was spoken of in these Scriptures, for Anointing was peculiar to the three characters or offices of Priest, Prophet, and King; which Jesus came on earth to fulfil; and they can in no sense be applied to the Godhead. See Note p. 136. But there are other striking circumstances in the context of the above cited passages, which afford further confirmation of this point. In **Matt. xvi. 13**, Jesus "asked his disciples, saying, whom do men say that I the Son of Man," an Individual of the Human species, who has taken part of flesh and blood, "am?" "They said, Some *say that thou art* John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets:" meaning, not the Outward form of any of these prophets, as their acquaintance with the person of John the Baptist sufficiently proved, but the Inward Man, Soul, or real Humanity of Jesus. This is not the place for discussing what were the sentiments which men then in general entertained of Jesus as the Son of Man, whether, for instance, they supposed that what is usually called the Soul or Spirit of John, Elias, &c. was embodied in him: the answer of the disciples given by Simon Peter, when they were asked, "But whom say ye that I am," is the proper subject for consideration: viz. "Thou art The

Christ δ Χριστός, The Son δ υἱός of the living God." As if they had said, Thou, who wast born of a woman, and therefore a Son of Man, art also The Messiah, which is, being interpreted, The Christ, the Son of the living God, who wast before all things, the First-born of every creature, and art now manifested to us in the flesh. In John vi. 69, there is also something very important on this point. "We believe and are sure that thou art that *or* the Christ δ Χριστός, that *or* the Son δ υἱός of the living God." The Jews had just before murmured at him because he said, "I am the bread that came down from heaven. And they said, Is not this Jesus the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven," and so maketh himself the Christ? Many of his disciples, who considered him as a prophet, but not as that prophet of whom Moses spake, had likewise murmured. "This is a hard saying, who can hear it? and from that time went back and walked no more with him." "Then said Jesus unto the Twelve, Will ye also go away?" Then "Simon," in the name of them all, "answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that thou art that *or* the Christ δ Χριστός, that *or* the Son δ υἱός, of the living God." As if he had replied, We know thee, viz. that fleshly tabernacle to which our eyes are directed, to be the Son of her who is called Mary, and (we know) James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas, to be thy brethren, and we confess thee moreover to be "that Anointed One," which should come into the world, even "that Son of the living God," which was with the Father before the world was, and when he came into the world was a manifestation of the First-born of every creature, the First-born among many brethren. Every male that is born of a woman is a Son of Man, בן אדם, but Jesus was That Son of Man, who, unlike all others, was to be the seed of the Woman exclusively to that of the Man, and who was to be the Incarnation of Messiah, the Son of God. The whole of the human species,

before as well as when they are manifested in this lower world, are all of them "Children of the Most High," בְּנֵי עֶלְיִן, but Jesus was that Son of God, "who is the image of the invisible God, the First-born of every creature, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." In John xi. 27, taken in connection with other parts of the chapter, the distinction between God and Jesus the Christ, the Individual or Personal character of each, and the Pre-existence of the latter are most apparent. "Jesus said this sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." "I know that even now," saith Martha unto Jesus, "whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee." "She saith unto him, Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art that Christ, that Son of God, which should come into the world": distinguishing him as an Individual from every other Christ or Anointed One, ("Touch not mine Anointed Ones, מְשִׁיחִי, and do my prophets no harm." Ps. cv. 15, in the Hebrew) whether priest, prophet, or king, and from every other Son, to whom the Spirit beareth witness with their spirit, that they are the Sons of God.

Acts viii. 37. "Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest [be baptized]. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."

The object of the Eunuch's faith is described in two ways: viz. He is the "Anointed Saviour," ὁ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, and "the Son of God," ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. But it is evident from the context, that these terms, though they speak of One person, yet they set him forth as consisting of Two Essences, one that was capable of dying, the other made to live for ever: or in other words, that they describe the complex creature Man, of Soul and Body subsisting. Philip hearing the Eunuch read the prophet Esaias said, "Understandest thou what thou readest? And he said, How can I except some Man τις should guide me? The place of the Scripture where he read was, He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his

mouth: in his humiliation his judgment was taken away, and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth. And the Eunuch answered Philip and said, I pray thee of whom [*περὶ τίνος* of what Man] speaketh the prophet this? of himself [a Man bearing a complex character, viz. a Body that may be brought to death by violence, and a Soul that will subsist when the Body shall be silent in the grave] or of some other Man *ετερος τίνος*, [a Man formed like himself with a mortal and immortal part?] Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him Jesus" as the Man from above, who, when he was manifested to Israel in the flesh, had his bodily life taken from the earth. "And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the Eunuch said, Sir, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest: and he answered and said, I believe that" that Man, "Jesus Christ," who on account of his Outward personal meanness was despised of the Jews, and was by them in the Body crucified and slain, "is" in his Soul and Inward Man "The Son of God," "That Christ, that Son of the living God," whom the Father sent to be the Saviour of the world.

The object of faith, as here stated, is plainly "Jesus Christ," "some other Man" than the prophet Esaias, who "was led as a sheep to the slaughter," and whose "life was taken from the earth": and the previous requisite for baptism was a belief that the same "Jesus Christ is the Son of God:" i. e. in the language of Paul, "that Jesus Christ [the Son of God] came into the world [a partaker of flesh and blood, the Son of Man, or in the fashion of the Outer Man] to save sinners."

Secondly. The term "Son of God" is found not only to denote the person of the Saviour Jesus Christ in the Inward but also in the Outward Man. This Outward Man called also his Body is an Entity fearfully and wonderfully made, whose Father was God, and, like the Inward Man or Soul,

possesses an Individuality or Personality, It constitutes, however neither in Jesus Christ nor in his Brethren, any part of the Humanity, being only the tabernacle of the real Man, in which he subsists all the days of his appointed time on earth. And because the Inward or real Man is not an object of immediate knowledge or preception, but is known, as far as he can be declared, only by the words or works of that tabernacle, that tabernacle, house, or habitation has likewise the name of Man or Humanity given to it. The following among other Scriptures bear testimony to this opinion.

Luke iii. 38. "Which was *the son* of Enos, which was *the son* of Seth, which was *the son* of Adam, which was *the son* of God."

If the ellipsis of "the Son," in this and the preceding verses, shall be determined to be properly supplied from verse 23, and no critic will be found to dispute it, this Scripture is decisive, that the term "Son of God" may be employed to denote the Outward Man, or the Body or Tabernacle in which the real Man, or the Humanity of, Jesus Christ dwells. It certainly is so in all the instances from Joseph to Adam. Nothing more could be intended than that a Body and not a Soul, an Outward and not an Inward Man, was of this or that person. The analogy of the case, if the word Adam itself did not prove it, would be sufficient for the assertion, that the term "Son of God" can in this place have reference to nothing more than a creature, and that the Body of Adam, and therefore may in other Scriptures also speak only of the Body or Outward Man of the Saviour Jesus Christ.

Gal. ii. 20.—"I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."

Of the identity of the person intended by the terms "Christ" and "Son of God" the Scriptures leave no doubt. Whoever Christ is, such therefore must be the Son of God. But Christ, as the word necessarily implies, (See p. 136,) is

a Creature, so must the Son of God be also. He is however a Creature which owns no fellow-creature as his generator. The power of the Highest overshadowed the Virgin Mother, and gave life to her Seed, to that holy tabernacle, which, like Him that dwelt therein, is also called the Son of God. So says the Scripture before us. The Son of God who loved and gave himself for the Apostle, is described in the beginning of this verse as "crucified," in the succeeding verse as "dead." This could not be the Inward Man or Soul of Him who was in the beginning. For though a Soul is capable of dying a spiritual death, it could not be "taken and by wicked hands crucified and slain." This is that of which it was said, "Forasmuch as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, [and of course had a pre-existent state like their elder Brother, who was chosen out of the people,] he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death [in the tabernacle of flesh and blood] he might destroy him that had the power of death." And—"Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful high-priest to make reconciliation for sins." Or in other words, the term "Son of God" joined with "Christ" being intended to express One who was fixed to a cross, and died thereon, must set forth the Body or Outward Man of Jesus, who in another place is said, "His own self to bear our sins in his own Body on the tree."

Heb. iv. 14.—"Seeing then that we have a great High-priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession."

What is attributed to Jesus, the Son of God, makes it impossible that he should be spoken of as God. He is "an high-priest"; and the priesthood cannot be attributed to Deity. He "was in all points tempted like as *we are*"; and God cannot be tempted of evil.

In chapter iii. Jesus is termed the Apostle and High-priest of our profession, and is compared to Moses for faithfulness: "Who was faithful to Him that appointed him." "This

Man *ευτος* was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who builded the house hath more honour than the house." A man may be compared to a man, but "who can be compared unto Jehovah? Who among the sons of the mighty can be likened unto Jehovah?" This Man moreover was pointed out by Moses as his Antitype, and could therefore be considered only as spoken of in the body, "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren," *i. e.* He shall be One of the seed of Abraham, and of the house and lineage of David, and consequently Jesus Christ the Son of God, can as compared with Moses, and declared to be worthy of more honour than him, be viewed only as of the Seed of David concerning the flesh. It behoves us therefore to enter into the holiest of all by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which he has consecrated for us through the vail, that is to say his flesh: and *having* an high-priest over the House of God, let us hold fast the profession [*ομολογειν confession*] of our faith without wavering. Neither can the term "Son of God" connected with the character of high-priest, be here applied to the "First-born among many brethren," "The beginning of the creation of God," who "was brought forth before the hills were," "before the mountains were settled." A high-priest ~~must~~ have reference to sin committed, and to sacrifices for sins. In this point of view the term "Son of God" cannot relate to the Inward Man or Soul of Jesus, but to the Body which he took, that he might have something to offer for sins.

The following Scripture will prove that the same may be said of the term "His Son" as of the term "Son of God."

Acts iii. 13, 26. "The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus, whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go.—Unto you first, God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

The context, when duly considered, will shew who is

intended by "His Son"; viz. that it is neither a Person in Deity, nor the pre-existent Lord, the Soul or Inward Man of him who is called Jesus, by whom the Father made all things, but the Body or Outward Man in which he was pleased to manifest himself. He who was "the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, hath glorified His Son Jesus": that Son, that Man, who lifted up his eyes to heaven and said, "Father, the hour is come, glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee": that Son, that Man, whom the men of Israel "delivered up and denied in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go": that Son, that Man, whom "God having raised up, sent him first to bless Israel in turning them away from their iniquities:" that Son, that Man, of whom Jehovah said unto Moses, "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words into his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, *that* whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." Can Beings with a more marked distinction of Personality, or opposition in Essence, be found than God and his Son Jesus? Can it with any propriety be said of the Inward Man or Soul of the Man Jesus Christ, that Pilate was determined to let it go? A body may be held by fetters: not so a Soul. An unjust judge may insultingly boast, Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thy body, and have power to release it! but has it been heard that any one ever reached such a pitch of madness, as vauntingly to exclaim to the Spirit while in the earthly house of its tabernacle, I have power to detain thee or to let thee go!

Rom. v. 8—10. "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Much more then being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son: much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."

Rom. viii. 32. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"

It will be sufficient in regard to the words quoted from Rom. v. to remind the reader, that the terms "Christ" and "His Son" being spoken of one and the same Being, no other than a creature can be intended by "His Son"; and from the accompanying words "Blood" and "Death," by "His Son" can be intended only the Body which the Pre-existing Son of God took for the suffering of death.

With respect to Rom. viii. 32, the words "His own" deserve particular attention, as implying a peculiarity and specialty of character rather than identity of Essence, *ἰδιον*, id quod alicui proprium, "that which belongs to some one in exclusion to all others." *ἰδιος υἱος*, "His own Son,"—properly and specially his—which is true not only of the Inward Man or Soul of the Redeemer, when brought into being as the First-born of every creature, but also of the Body or Outward Man with which he was invested in the womb of the Virgin by the power of God, without the co-operation, or rather instrumentality of his creature Man, and so a Son in whom no other as a Father had any property or specialty.*

1 Thess. i. 10. "And to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, *even* Jesus which delivered us from the wrath to come."

Of this text it cannot be said, that Jesus, "His Son" is identified in Essence or Individuality with God. God indeed

* If the philosophical or physical reader shall object to this sentiment, he is referred to the discovery made by Fallopius for its elucidation. The writer is aware that his manner of expression is not accurately physical. It would have been no easy matter to have put the subject on a level with the comprehension of the unlearned on this subject, without entering into a discussion altogether foreign to the present work. What has been said is declarative of a truth, omitting the Rationale of its accomplishment. The inquisitive reader will find something capable of throwing an indirect light on this subject, in a work intitled, "The Study of Medicine," by J. M. Good, M.D. vol. v. p. 27, second edition, 1825.

delivers all who are rescued from any evil, for "of God are all things": but God effects his purposes of mercy and power by Jesus Christ his Son. "God was *εν* with *ορ* through Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." And that this His Son, his instrument of deliverance may not be mistaken, it is said to the church at Colosse, "In whom we have redemption through his blood"; and to that of Thessalonica, "To wait for His Son from heaven whom he raised from the dead, *even* Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come." The circumstances of His Son shedding his blood to redeem, and being raised from the dead after redeeming us to God by his blood, points out, that the term His Son relates to the Body or Outward Man: and that That Body which the heavens must contain till the restitution of all things, shall at that time be revealed from heaven, that they who said they would not have Him to reign over them, may look on him whom they "pierced, and mourn as one mourneth for *his* only Son.

1 John. i. 7. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth from all sin."

No comment is necessary to establish the reference of the words "His Son" in this place to the body which Jesus Christ assumed of the Virgin Mary, or to shew that they can have no relation to Deity. Could God bleed? Could the Soul or Inward Man of the Redeemer shed any blood? The day is passed for attempting to inforce the former supposition by urging the *κοινωνια ιδιωµατων*, or "communication of properties"; and the latter will be allowed by all to be impossible. Nothing therefore remains but that the term "His Son" must relate to the Tabernacle or Outward Man. And however habit, founded on the want of reflection, may upon the first impression lead the mind to consider, that a Spiritual Being of some order must be the object of the Apostle in this passage, yet not only the obvious sense of the words themselves, but the concurrent testimony of the Scriptures throughout, which shew that the great work of Redemption is begun,

carried on, and will be finished by the medium of the Body or Outward Man of the Lord Jesus Christ, prove that That Son which originated from the power of the Most High in the womb of the Virgin, does by his blood cleanse from all sin.

The following texts are given, not with a view of proving that the term "Son of Man" means the Outward Man or Body which was taken by the Pre-existent Creature-Saviour, but for the purpose of shewing that some of the high offices or actions which are attributed to the Soul or Inward Man of the Redeemer, have reference only to the Body with which he was clothed. The lordship or dominion of the Outward Man is one of the great purposes of God in the Redemption of sinners. The first Adam had it, and exercised it over all the creatures that then existed. He lost it. The second Adam is invested with it, as these Scriptures declare.

Ps. viii. 4—6. "What is the Son of Man that thou visiteth him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands." Compare Heb. ii. 6—8.

Ps. lxxx. 17. "Let thy right hand be [thy right hand shall be, *Heb.*] upon the Man of thy right hand, upon the Son of Man whom thou madest strong for thyself."

Philipp. ii. 9. "Wherefore God hath highly exalted him [viz. Christ Jesus, who being found in fashion as the Outward or Son of Man, became obedient to death, even the death of the cross] and given him a name which is above every name."

The same exalted Creature will openly exercise his delegated dominion when he shall be revealed from heaven, as the following Scriptures shew.

Dan. vii. 13, 14. "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and there was given him Dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should

serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Matt. xxiv. 30, 31. "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

Matt. xxv. 31, 32. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate," &c.

This is the reason why the Son of God, or the Inward Man, as Son of Man, or by his Body, carries on and completes the whole work of Redemption. By that Body on the cross he redeems from the guilt of sin, as these Scriptures prove.

Is. liii. 5. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."

1 Pet. ii. 24. "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed."

By that Body he destroyed him that hath the power of death, as the following Scripture declares.

Heb. ii. 14. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil."

By that Body the Church is governed now, as these Scriptures testify.

Matt. ix. 6. "But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, he saith," &c.

Matt. xii. 8. "The Son of Man is lord even of the sabbath day."

Eph. i. 20—22. "He wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places: far above all principality and power, and

government of all things, as also the final great day, according to these Scriptures.

31. "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels to gather together his elect from the four winds, from the one end of the earth to the other."

4. "Jesus saith unto him, I say unto you, hereafter ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the Father, and coming in the clouds of heaven."

32. "When the Son of Man shall come, he shall be accompanied of all the holy angels with him, then shall he be clothed with the brightness of his glory: and before him shall be the twelve tribes of Israel; and he shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." &c.

27. "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son;—and hath given him power also to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man."

1. "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by *that* man whom he hath appointed; *whereof* he hath given assurance unto all men, that he hath raised him from the dead."

might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head to the church."

Heb. ii. 8. "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all things under him, [the Son of Man, ver. 6] he left nothing that is not put under him."

By that Body shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, according to the following Scriptures.

Dan. vii. 27. "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom."

Matt. 19, 28. "Ye that have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

By that Body is carried on the work of Mediation and Intercession in the kingdom of God, as these Scriptures prove.

Rom. viii. 34. "It is Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."

1 Tim. ii. 5. "*There* is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus: who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time."

Heb. vii. 24, 25. This *man*, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come to God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

1 John ii. 1, 2. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins."

To that Body, when it shall be revealed from heaven, shall

be committed the government of all things, as also the final judgment of the great day, according to these Scriptures.

Matt. xxiv. 30, 31. "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels," &c.

Matt. xxvi. 64. "Jesus saith unto him, I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."

Matt. xxv. 31, 32. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth," &c.

John v. 22, 27. "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son—and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man."

Acts xvii. 31. "He hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by *that* man whom he hath ordained; *whereof* he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

CHAPTER VI.

THE terms, "Son," "Son of God," "The Son," "His Son," &c. have not been more successfully employed in perverting the New Testament Scriptures, than the terms, "The Word," "The Word of the Lord," "The Word of God," have been in confounding the sense of both Old and New Testament with respect to the person of Messiah. The student, who is able to read the original of the latter only, often confounds words and things which are very dissimilar, in consequence of the common error of calling other Men Master, for which no talents nor purity of intention can compensate. And the student who has made some proficiency in a right knowledge of the original Language in which the former is written, from an undue partiality to the authority of men to whom the meed of praise is too indiscriminately awarded, consents to take their decisions, both as the guide of his understanding, and the rule of his conscience. These things ought not to be. But that they are so, and that they increase the triumph of the gainsayer, multiply the perplexities of the well-meaning, and confirm error in the larger part of inquiring Christians, the following observations will tend to prove.

The source of all our ignorance on those several points which relate to the Pre-existent Messiah as a Man, may be confidently asserted to be found in the determination which mankind have almost universally manifested, of deriving all their ideas, and of course all their knowledge of the Lord's Christ, from any language but the Hebrew. The admonition which was given on this head is both plain and positive:

"Search the [Hebrew] Scriptures, they are they which testify of me." The English term "Word" by which the Messiah is so repeatedly denominated in both Testaments, presents no more to our understanding than a something that is spoken or uttered articulately by an intelligent Being. The Greek term *λογος* is more extensive in its signification. Besides "Speech" it means that discursive faculty which of all creatures on earth men alone possess, viz. "Reason." Other interpretations arising from or branching out of these two might be added, but, like the English term "Word," none of them present to us any other idea than that which accompanies or is connected with speech or articulate utterance. And consistently with this idea, the mind can entertain no notion that, what so proceeds from an intelligent Being, is a constituent part of that Being from whom it comes, much more that it is his very Essence. Upon what ground then have Divines, through so many centuries, asserted, that the terms "Word" and *λογος* are appellations of Jehovah, designating him in One of the Trine-plurality in which he has revealed himself to his Church? A reference to that language in which the record of his will was originally made, and to which recourse must be had upon all occasions, if we would rightly understand what his last revelation contains, will shew what later tongues have no means of teaching us. From the Hebrew the intimate or ideal sense of the terms "Word" and *λογος* will be discovered; and through that we shall be led to a plain development of the character of Him, who being the power of God, and the wisdom of God, great in counsel and mighty in doing, has been confounded with Jehovah of hosts, of whom and through whom and by whom he is, and from whom he proceeded as the creature of his hand.

דבר, the corresponding term with "Word" and *λογος*, in its verbal form, signifies to "utter the thoughts or conceptions of the mind": to "bring forth to the perception of others what is hidden or concealed within ourselves." דבר, when applied to "Speech," is therefore "the hidden thing of our

mind, will or affections, brought to light." It is something that proceeds from us, but is no constituent part of us, and certainly is not of our Essence, though it may reveal to others our character as well as our designs. How aptly does this Hebrew term set forth the Christ of God! How significantly does it express the purposes of Jehovah which were hidden in him before the world was, and which have been manifested through him in the different ages that have succeeded each other!

Messiah is indeed the "Word," *Λογος*, דבר of Jehovah. As men discover their sentiments and designs to each other by their words, so Jehovah by his Messiah discovers his designs of Grace to his people, as also of Justice to them that are not his people. And as words are no constituent part of the man who utters them, so Messiah is not of the Essence of Jehovah from whom he came forth. Words proceed from man and indicate his character and intentions. Messiah proceeded from Jehovah, and declared him to be "merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear *the guilty*."

It will be proper to consider how far the texts in which the English term "Word," "Word of the Lord," "Word of God," with the corresponding terms in the languages of the Old and New Testament, confirm this statement. דבר occurs as a common noun more than seven hundred times in the Old Testament. There are however some few instances in which it must be granted to be used as a proper noun. This indeed is not denied, though there is a doubt whether on these occasions it is intended to set forth Jehovah in One of the Trine-Plurality, or his Son and Servant and Creature, the Messiah.

The attention of the reader is requested while the following Scriptures, which have been particularly adduced in support of the former opinion, are carefully considered.

Gen. xv. 1, 4, 5. "After these things the Word of the Lord came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram :

I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward.—And, behold, the Word of the Lord *came* unto him, saying, This shall not be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven," &c.

The individual character of what is here called the "Word of Jehovah" is too evident to be mistaken if attention be paid to the context. But a doubt has arisen who the individual is. He describes himself as the "Shield and exceeding great reward" of Abram. The Margin and commentators bring the book of Psalms in proof that Jehovah is the shield and reward of Abram, as they there assume him to be of David. If this assumption should fall to the ground, the proof of the former opinion will not have that foundation to rest upon which is expected on this occasion. In Psalm xci. 4, Jehovah is undoubtedly the shield of the person who speaks. But this person is not David. It is Messiah, as subsequent verses which are quoted by two Evangelists fully prove. The same might be said of every other Psalm, though a similar confirmation is not always immediately at hand. Jehovah alone was the shield of his Son Jesus. All others fled, and forsook him. The Psalms were written for the purpose of establishing him in this hope in every tribulation: "Call upon me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me": and of testifying to the Church in every succeeding age, that as he was heard when he offered up prayers and supplications, so they coming boldly through him to the same throne of grace that they may obtain mercy, shall find grace to help in time of need. Against this interpretation, which limits Jehovah's immediate aid to Messiah alone of all his creatures, it will be urged that Abram is said on this occasion to believe in Jehovah, and that he addressed him by the Title "Lord GOD, אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה, whereby shall I know," &c. The reply is ready, and to the point. "No man hath seen God [Jehovah] at any time." "Ye have neither heard his voice, nor seen his shape." When Jehovah appears or speaks it is by his Word, his Creature, Messiah. "He is the image

of the invisible God." "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." When "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God" is given to his people, it is "in the face of Jesus Christ." He "is the express image of his person": and by him Jehovah here spake in vision unto Abram.

1 Sam. iii. 7, 21. "Now Samuel did not yet know the Lord, neither was the word of the Lord yet revealed unto him.— And the Lord appeared again in Shiloh for the Lord revealed himself to Samuel in Shiloh by the Word of the Lord."

The Hebrew of ver. 7, is literally, "Thus Samuel ere [וְעַד] which is so rendered in ver. 3] he knew Jehovah, and ere the Word of Jehovah was revealed unto him." The Margin reads, "Thus did Samuel before he knew the Lord, and before the Word of the Lord was revealed unto him." These three renderings have in effect the same signification, and are parallel to Acts xix. 2, cited also in the Margin: We have not so much as heard whether the Holy Ghost be revealed: *εἰ πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἐστὶ*. Yet the point in doubt is, whether that which is spoken of as not revealed was Jehovah in both instances, or whether Messiah, the creature of Jehovah, is not spoken of in the first. The twenty-first verse will assist in resolving the difficulty. "And Jehovah appeared again in Shiloh: for Jehovah revealed himself to Samuel in Shiloh by the Word of Jehovah." The opinion, which many have formed, that by the "Word of Jehovah" is intended Jehovah in One of the Trine-Plurality, is not tenable. To say that Jehovah revealed himself by himself carries no great perspicuity with it. To say that Jehovah revealed himself in one person by means of another person, is liable to the same objection, if it does not involve a contradiction. But the original is *כִּי נִגְלָה יְהוָה*, "For Jehovah was revealed." The question is how he was revealed. To contend that he was revealed as Jehovah by One of the Trine-Plurality, asserted to be called "The Word," is begging the question. *נִלָּה* is to "remove, uncover, discover, reveal or throw back the veil": and Scripture alone can determine how the veil is removed by which

Jehovah is unfolded to our eyes, at least so far as we are capable of contemplating him in his ways and works; for in no other manner is he or can he be seen or known by us. According to what Scriptures say, "No man hath seen God at any time, or can see him"—and he giveth "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." When therefore we read that "Jehovah appeared in Shiloh," it is added, that he was revealed by his Word, or the Pre-existent Lord and Man Jesus Christ, who is the only "Mediator between God and Men"; the appointed mean by which he discovers to men in every age what he designs they should know of him in his operations toward the children of Men.

1 Sam. xv. 10, 23, 26. "Then came the Word of the Lord unto Samuel, saying—Because thou [Saul] hast rejected The Word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king—Thou hast rejected the Word of the Lord, and the Lord hath rejected thee from being king over Israel."

The language of Scripture is "Jehovah reigneth": He is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords,—with whom is power and dominion for ever and ever. But the language of Scripture is also, "God in all things is glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom is power and dominion for ever and ever."—"Unto Jesus Christ that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood—to him is glory and dominion for ever and ever." To this Jesus, The Christ of God, "The Son of Man, was given dominion, and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom *that* which shall not be destroyed." Dan. vii. 13, 14. This Jesus, the Son of God, the first-born of every creature, was the King by whom Jehovah reigned over Israel, until they demanded a King to judge them like all the nations: and this Jesus will be king by whom Jehovah will reign till he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father. It was for rejecting this king, the Word of Jehovah, under whom Saul

reigned, that wrath came upon him, and the kingdom of Israel was rent from him. "Thou hast rejected the Word of Jehovah, and Jehovah hath rejected thee from being king over Israel." It was for rejecting this king when he came in the flesh, lowly and riding upon an Ass, that the children of Israel have abided so "many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and *without* teraphim." And it will not be till "the children of Israel shall return and seek Jehovah their Aleim, and the Beloved אֶת דָּרִיד their king in the latter days," that Jerusalem shall be in peace for evermore.

1 Kings xiii. 9, 17. "For so was it charged me by the Word of the Lord, saying, Eat no bread," &c.—"For it was said to me by the Word of the Lord thou shalt eat no bread," &c.

1 Kings xix. 9, 11. "Behold the Word of the Lord *came* to him; and he said unto him, What doest thou here Elijah?—And he said, Go forth, and stand upon the mount before the Lord."

2 Kings iii. 11, 12. "But Jehoshaphat said, *Is there* not here a prophet of the Lord, that we may inquire by him? And one of the King of Israel's servants answered and said, here is Elisha—And Jehoshaphat said, the Word of the Lord is with him."

The charge given, as well as the words spoken in the first instance, was pronounced by some one who was not Jehovah, for in the communing that took place there was an appearance and a voice. Neither of these could be Jehovah's, for he dwelleth "in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see." The same may be observed in the second instance, and for the same reason. The Word of Jehovah came to Elijah and said to him, "What doest thou here, Elijah?" "Go forth and stand upon the mount before Jehovah." If the speaker had been Jehovah in person, he would have rather said, "Stand before me." It is indeed immediately added, "Behold, Jehovah passed by,"

and in a subsequent verse, "Jehovah said unto him, Go, return on thy way," &c. But the Scripture saith, and the Scriptures cannot be broken, "no man hath seen God at any time." "Ye have neither heard his voice nor seen his shape." Whether then it be the disobedient prophet, or Elijah to whom the Word of Jehovah appeared and spoke, or Elisha with whom the Word of Jehovah was, it could be no other than his Pre-existent Son and Creature by whom Jehovah spake and appeared unto the Church in all ages.

Psalm cvii. 20. "He sent his Word and healed them."

If the reader will refer to the remarks made in pp. 147, 148, on the word "Sent," he will perhaps be satisfied that the "Word" whom Jehovah sent could not be himself, as One of the Trine-Plurality, but must be the creature of his hand. It may however be objected that "his Word healed," and in another place that Jehovah declares healing to be his prerogative: "I *am* Jehovah that healeth thee." This is not however contradictory, as a proper attention to the time when this declaration was made, and the circumstances that attended it, will shew. The bitter waters of Marah were made sweet by means of a tree which was cast into it at Jehovah's command. The miraculous change was undoubtedly effected by Jehovah's power, for all things are of Jehovah. But he doth all things by some mean or agent. And it is well known and is deserving of particular attention, that, in relieving the temporal wants of his people Israel, he repeatedly employed the agency of some instrument, which in another place is made a symbol of his Son Jesus. Jehovah healed the waters of Marah by a Tree: and it is unnecessary to remind the Scripture reader, that under the emblem of the 'Tree of life in the midst of the garden of Eden, and of the Tree of life in the midst of the street of the new Jerusalem, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations, the Lord's Christ, who when incarnate was the Lamb that was slain, to redeem unto God by his blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, is described. This is his Word whom Jehovah

sent from heaven ; by whom he speaketh peace to them that cry to him in their trouble, and healeth all their diseases. The Spirit of the Lord was upon him, because he had anointed him to preach the gospel to the poor. He sent him to heal the broken-hearted—to set at liberty them that are bruised.

From these few Old Testament texts on which much stress has been laid, it may be seen how far that opinion rests on Scripture for its support, which is so generally adopted by Christians of every denomination, viz. that by the term “ Word ” Jehovah has spoken of himself in One of the Trine-Plurality. And if these strong-holds fall so easily before the Ark of the testimony, it is unnecessary to speak of others which are allowed to present difficulties of a less formidable aspect. Other Scriptures, which are usually adduced on this occasion, are all capable of a similar solution with those which have been discussed, and shewn to speak of Jehovah’s marvellous ways and works by Messiah his Son. By Him, the Beginning, Jehovah Aleim formed the heavens and the earth. By Him he made all things, and without him was not any thing made that was made. By Him he hath ruled his creatures in every past age, avenging his people, and destroying their enemies. And by Him, when the appointed ages shall have finished their courses, he will finally restore all things. This opinion is not new in the Church of God. His ancient people, the seed of Abraham, in the earlier period of their calling, held it most firmly. It was the foundation of their confidence when the light of Jehovah’s countenance shone upon them, and of their hope when he hid his face from them. Nor was it altogether lost to them in the times of that spiritual darkness which immediately preceded as well as succeeded the Advent of Messiah in the flesh.

In the following representation of the views of the Jewish writers on this subject, it is not intended that they should be considered even as an indirect proof that the sentiment already recorded is just. It is designed only to shew that that highly favoured people, to whom the invaluable treasure

of the Hebrew Scriptures was committed, have not, as is confidently affirmed, uniformly and unequivocally in all ages decided, that the expression "Word of Jehovah" relates to the Essence of Deity: and that they furnish sufficient ground for the assertion, that some at least of them considered it as presenting to their view one distinct from Deity, a Creature of exceeding great majesty and dignity.*

The Chaldee paraphrasts abound with confirmations that the term "Word" was not intended to exhibit a divine attribute, as the early Socinians of our country asserted, but a real and proper Person or Individual, one who possessed an intelligent and free principle of action. They represent him as a Being distinct from Jehovah, as something different from Him, the One, true, and only Supreme. They speak of him as an agent or minister in forming the heavens and the earth, and as a governor, from the time of that formation, of the affairs of the universe, but more especially of the Church: for it is a position of the Jewish Divines, from which they never deviate, that Jehovah performs no works by his own hands. Where the face, eyes, mouth, hand, arm, &c. of Jehovah, are expressed in the Hebrew, they generally use the phrase "Word of Jehovah." For as no such parts can belong to Jehovah, and they are only the instruments by which what the Apostle calls the Inward man works his will, being no integral part of the man, so they consider Jehovah as

* Dr. Kuinæ, in his *Prolegomena to the Gospel of John*, vide Comment. in libros N. T. Hist. p. 84—91, has given a variety of Rabbinical citations to prove, that at the time of the Incarnation of our Lord, the opinions which existed among the Jews, in relation to the nature and person of their then expected Messiah, were by no means uniform. Some affirmed that he would be a Man endowed with peculiar powers and assistance from God. Others contended that he would be a Man with whom a special power emanating from God would be intimately conjoined. Others maintained that he would be superior to their fathers, to all mankind, and to the angels: that he existed before the creation of the world, and was employed by God as an instrument in the formation and government of the world, and peculiarly in giving protection and religious instruction to the Israelite nation.

working his will by his Word. And as they have thus illustrated rather than translated the name "Jehovah" by the phrase "The Word of Jehovah," so they have also put the term "Word" absolutely, making it evident that the expression "The Word of Jehovah" is no periphrasis to set forth Jehovah or something subsisting in him, but that which is in no wise Jehovah, that which forms no part whatever of Jehovah, viz. that highly exalted creature by whom he does all things in heaven above, in the earth beneath, and in the waters under the earth.

The passages which might be quoted on these several points amount to many hundreds. Buxtorf, in his *Chaldee Lexicon*, says, "the name Jehovah is almost always (sæpissimè) expressed by "the Word of Jehovah." "Where," says Allix, "the Hebrew Text has Jehovah Elohim, or simply the name Jehovah, the Targums generally have the Word of the Lord." *Judgment of the Jewish Church*, p. 195. What the Paraphrasts designed to represent to be the Essence of the person of the Word, whether that of a creature or of Jehovah, will be easily learned if due attention be paid to their language. And if it should be determined that that speaks of a creature, his character will be as easily traced by the same means to be in opposition to modern Socinians, who acknowledge indeed that it sets forth a Person or Individual, even the Man Jesus Christ, but persist in attributing no other work of Creation to him than that of the Church, which is, according to them, the new World. The Paraphrasts every where speak of the Word as a creature, as they also ascribe what is usually termed the Creation of the World to him. And however difficult it may be for prejudice to assent, it admits of no doubt, from the use they make of the word translated Creation, that they intended no more than what a creature could effect, viz. the Formation of matter already brought into being by the power of Jehovah. The following instances will suffice. Job. xxx. 19, לֹאדָם דַּתְּבְּרָא מִן טִינָא "To man who was formed of clay." Ps.

lxxxix. 48, **אֲדַכֵּר דִּי אֲנָא אֲתִבְרִיתִי מִן עָפְרָא** "Remember that I am formed from the dust." Mal. ii. 10, **אֱלֹהִי אֶחָד**, **בְּרָא יְתֵנָּא** "Hath not one God formed us." The action expressed by **בְּרָא**, which act is attributed to the Word, is not therefore according to them inconsistent with his character as a creature: and it is perhaps owing only to the erroneous sense which has been so long attributed to the word "Creation," that so many have pronounced with such confidence, that the Targumists speak of Jehovah himself, when they use the phrase **מִיִּמְרָא דִּי**, rather than of his Creature the Word.

From the authority of the Chaldee paraphrasts, therefore, it appears, that the idea is not of modern date, which sets forth Jehovah Aleim as the author of every act of love, mercy and power, manifesting himself to his creature man in these respects through another, called his Word, wholly distinct from himself in Essence, with whom he is, and by whom he does all things, giving him all power, declaring him to be his only begotten Son, and proclaiming him to be his servant in whom he delighteth.

The modern Jews, who are justly accused of having too low views of the person of the Messiah whom they expect, will be seen, when the matter is rightly understood, not to differ so entirely from their fathers as is generally supposed, though they are by no means of one mind with them. The Jews, for some centuries at least before the Incarnation, attributed all blessings and judgments to the **מִיִּמְרָא דִּי**, or "Word of Jehovah." It was he who, in their interpretation of Scriptures appeared to the patriarchs, who gave the Law at Sinai, who led them through the wilderness, who destroyed their enemies, who was the King that punished them for their transgressions, and graciously pardoned them when they repented and turned from their evil ways. It was this high and exalted One who had been their first, and as they inferred from Ps. lxxii. 8, Dan. ii. 35, 44, would be their last king; whom they expected would come to deliver them from the

power of the Romans, and who, dwelling in the flesh in the midst of his people, would set up his kingdom among them: for they expected a display in the flesh of that created glory which had so often confounded their enemies, and comforted themselves. The modern Jews, because they look for no other Messiah than a Man, a Ben Joseph, or a Ben David, disavowing the notion, so current among some of their more immediate progenitors, as also among Christians, that the Messiah foretold by the prophets, would be Jehovah Incarnate, are condemned as forsaking the faith of their forefathers. In this respect it will be no easy matter to prove from the Hebrew Scriptures, that they are wrong, though, undoubtedly according to Holy Writ, they err in not confessing Jesus who is come in the flesh to be The Christ. The modern Jews may also be charged with another error in regard to Jesus whom they reject, as they can be likewise shewn to err in regard to the Messiah whom they expect to see. In neither, like many Christians of later times, and unlike their fathers of some centuries past, do they acknowledge any Pre-existence.*

* It will not be foreign to the subject, to say a few words in this place of the Angel Metatron, a name given since the Incarnation to him whom the ancient Jews called *מיכאל* *די*, or "The Word of Jehovah," and who is undoubtedly the same with him. If the opinions which the Jews held of this highly exalted Person, in what may be called the middle ages of their history, viz. between the period of the Incarnation, and the last of their Rabbinical Writers, be considered, the creature-character of the Metatron will hardly be disputed, notwithstanding the repeated inconsistencies and contradictions which are found in all their Authors. It is not perhaps possible at this moment to determine whether they borrowed their error first from the early Christians, or the Christians from them; but it is sufficiently obvious that with whomsoever the error originated, the splendor of the Majesty and the exceeding greatness of the works which are properly attributed to this representative of Jehovah, together with an unhappy perversion of some of the leading terms which describe his personal character and wonderful operations, so confounded the understanding of many, that they determined, however contradictory to their Scriptures as well as to their senses, to consider Messiah, when he should come, as an Incarnation of Jehovah, and not of his Pre-existent First-born, his only begotten Son and Servant. This will appear from

A Son of Man, whose origin is to be dated some thousands of years after the heavens and the earth were made, is all they expect. The Son of God, who was the First-born of every creature, and as such the only begotten Son of God, is in none of their thoughts. Herein they err against their own Scriptures, and oppose the sentiments which their earlier forefathers entertained of the Word, as the Angel, the Servant, the Prophet of Jehovah. These affirmed that when Messiah should appear on earth he was to have the Word dwelling in him, distinguishing between the early manifestation of the Pre-existent Saviour, whom in that state they call **מִימְרָא דִּי** "The Word of Jehovah," and his appearance in the flesh in the last times, of whom they then speak as **מְשִׁיחָא** "The Christ." To the modern Jews may be imputed also another error. This arises from the supposition, and

the descriptions of Metatron. He is called "Almighty," the "Prince of the World, the "Angel," or "Legate of Jehovah"; and in this character he is compared with other Angels. Jehovah is said to be his "Master." He is termed a "Man," an "Angel," "a man the image of God." He is said to be "created the first," and to be "the origin of all the hosts of heaven and earth." "A ruling agent in the place of God." The "God of the earth." The "Legate of Jehovah, who is over and above him, who has invested him with the sovereignty of the universe, and made him lord of his house." The "Lord in whom are the mercies." The "same with the Law, the Word, and the Wisdom of Jehovah." The "High Priest, the Prince of the divine presence, officiating in the temple of the heavenly Jerusalem." The "Prince of the presence who always beholds the face of Jehovah." The generality of the Jews of the period alluded to, believed him whom they call Metatron to be the Messiah, the Word, in the language of Christians before his Incarnation, but in their's, the Soul of Messiah, which they consider to be something between God and the Angels, and between whom and the living God, there is no other Being. But in all that has been thus said, whether of the Metatron of the more modern Jews, or of the **מִימְרָא דִּי** of the Targumists, it is again remarked, that nothing more is intended than to shew, that the Pre-existent Creature-character of the Word is not a novelty, whether it can be charged with heresy or not. The truth of this and of every other doctrine, contended to be derived from Holy Writ, must stand or fall by the Scriptures: and to the Scriptures alone would the writer appeal in support of what has been or shall be advanced in the present work.

indeed not without reason, if their language alone be considered, that Christians are Tritheists. From the second century there are proofs that the descendants of Abraham have opposed the doctrine of the Christian Church in regard to a Trine Plurality, because in the statements that were made of it they saw the Unity of Jehovah contradicted. But, long before that time, there are indubitable testimonies, that their fathers held and taught a Trine Plurality in which Jehovah has revealed himself. Herein therefore they err, not searching into the traditions of their fathers, or the sacred records of their Scriptures, and so reject altogether the truth which the Divine Oracles contain, and what their progenitors received from them as the revelation of Jehovah, their Aleim, Jehovah One.

From the Old Testament Scriptures we learn that there is One who has the Pre-eminence in all things, named the "Word of Jehovah." The New Testament is in perfect harmony with the Old, attesting the same truth, with similar marked distinctions which point out his Creature-character. A disregard to the original language in which the former is written, has led many to overlook the testimony which it bears to this exalted Person, and to confound him with Jehovah of hosts. This is seen in the term דבר. The same may be said of the latter; and a few instances will be sufficient to shew, that the Λογος of the New Testament writers has not been better understood by the generality of Christians than the דבר of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Luke i. 2. "Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word."

Whenever men have adopted any system or opinion, they too generally, in their eagerness to establish their favorite subject, direct their attention to those circumstances which seem to confirm their views, while they pass by what is in opposition to all their arguments, though it lies immediately before them. The advocates for the opinion that the term

Λογος is applied to Jehovah as One of the Trine-Plurality, and it must be confessed that there are few who think otherwise, are wont, in their zeal to carry their point, to suffer their usual prudence and discrimination to forsake them. The different senses in which the term *Λογος* is capable of being used, is not the only way by which they are led to this self-deception in the conclusions which they draw. Not a few, who are able to detect the error, allow their understanding to be misled by what is evidently a false translation of some accompanying word in the construction, which on any other occasion they would immediately perceive, and so confirm themselves in the error which they have adopted. In the above quotation from Luke's Gospel we have an instance of this. The first word in construction with *Λογος*, viz. *αυτοπται*, "eye-witnesses," which makes it necessary to consider *Λογος* as speaking of a creature, for the express declaration of Jehovah will not admit of contradiction, "There shall no man see my face and live," has caused the rejection of it as referring to that Person in the Trine-Plurality, of which it is asserted many Scriptures bear testimony that it is called *δ Λογος* "The Word." The adoption of *Λογος* as meaning the Gospel, or the written or preached Word, is therefore preferred, without considering the contradiction, and absurdity, and false translation that follow: for whatever currency the authority of men, wise in their generation, may give to the sentiment of being "eye-witnesses of the Gospel," or the written or preached Word, it involves both contradiction and absurdity. This being disregarded, or reconciled by making the Apostle to convey the truth at the expence of a catechesis, it next becomes necessary to adopt a still more harsh measure, viz. a false translation of the second term in construction with *Λογος*. *Τηρεται*, which means "they who serve, minister unto, or assist" another who is superior, must therefore have a new turn given to it.* To make the Apostle

* This is not the only place where *υπηρετης* is erroneously rendered "Minister," in the sense usually attributed to it in our vernacular

say "Eye-witnesses and servants of the Gospel," would not have agreed with the simplicity and perspicuity of an inspired writer. The equivocal word "Minister," which may be applied to *Λογος* as signifying the Gospel, is therefore substituted. The harshness of "eye-witnesses" thus becomes less revolting, and the term *Λογος* is rescued from the imputation of speaking of a creature, that had been "seen with the eyes," and had been "looked upon" by those disciples who had made their report to the Apostle Luke. Such is the consequence of receiving the traditions or decisions of men for the counsel of God!

When Jesus entered upon his public ministry he called his Twelve Apostles, and afterwards his Seventy Disciples. These were Eye-witnesses of his miracles, as they also bare testimony to the truth of his incarnation, resurrection, and ascension. These likewise ministered unto him in temporal wants, as they did unto others for his sake when sent by him. Such circumstances are in themselves sufficient to decide who and what the term *Λογος* here mentioned is. But collateral proofs are at hand, which when stated will corroborate what has been asserted of his creature-character: "When the Comforter is come," says Christ, "he shall testify of me, and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." And what did they witness concerning him? The same disciple tells us, "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life: (for the life was manifested, and we have seen *it*, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was mani-

speech, and very frequently in our translation of the Scripture, viz. Luke iv. 20, "He gave it [the book] to the servant": *τῷ υπακιστῇ*, whose duty it was to give the book to the reader, and receive it from him again to deposit in its place. Acts xiii. 5, "They [Paul and Barnabas] had also John as servant": *Ιωαννην υπακιστην*, to assist them in their office, and to minister to their temporal wants.

fested unto us :) that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us." Could they have heard, seen, looked upon, and handled any thing but a creature? And was not he in all points, sin excepted, like them with whom he conversed? He the head, they members of his body. The difference lies in his priority, "Who was the first-born of every creature," and in his delegated superiority, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." He was in the full perfection of his being "from the beginning," for "He is before all things." He was "with the Father" "before ever the earth was," and was manifested on earth in the fulness of the time, when he was being of a woman. Of this Incarnation of the Pre-existent Word, and the redemption wrought out by him when the Father sent him in the likeness of sinful flesh, there were many eye-witnesses. From them Luke had received what they had to report: and having a firm faith in their testimony, he recorded it for the hope and consolation of generations to come.

John i. 1, 2, 14. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God, and the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth."

If the definitions of the schools, whether of the term "Son," or "Word," are considered, it will be impossible to understand them without first supposing that they are intended to describe a creature, notwithstanding what is asserted of each as God. But Christians, especially Protestants, who call no man Master, must turn from the testimony of fallible men to what "holy men of God spake, *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost." The authority of John in the use of the term "Word" has not been disputed; nor have any doubts been entertained of its being familiar to his countrymen, for whose edification in the first instance his Gospel

was written. The object of our attention is therefore **What** and **Whom** this Evangelist intended to describe by $\delta \Lambda \omicron \gamma \omicron \varsigma$, "The Word." John declares that "In the beginning" the Word was, and then repeats this circumstance with an addition, saying, the same was in the beginning "with God."* If the usual and literal meaning of these expressions were attended to, it would be hardly necessary to point out how strikingly they set forth a Creature, together with some peculiarities in that creature's Origin and character. While Jehovah was sole Existent, which however incomprehensible to us must have been the case, till he went forth in action to produce the first creature, whether the mundane system, or any other of his works be considered as such, there was no Beginning. When he brought that creature into a state of first existence, "from then," אָנָן in the language of the Old Testament, was The Beginning. Of Jehovah it can with no propriety be said that he was "in the beginning," because he was before the beginning. The assertion conveys no information, and amounts nearly to an absurdity; for he that brings into being is necessarily before that which is brought into being. The production into being of the First-born of every creature, whatever it was, therefore constituted the beginning of what is called Time there wherever it was produced: as the existence of that creature constituted the beginning of Creation wheresoever it began to exist. And whatever name might afterwards be given to that Creature, it is justly called The Beginning. The language of the Old Testament on this point has been considered, and it has been proved to lead immediately to a right knowledge of both **What** and **Whom** John intended to describe in the Scripture

* "In the beginning"—of what, was the Word? Certainly of something, but not of Eternity, according to the usual signification of the term. That could have no Beginning. It must then be of Time. And if the Word was in the beginning of Time, and not before, what becomes of his Deity? "Ye have known Him *that is* from the Beginning" [viz.] of Time": not from Eternity, which has no Beginning.

before us. Moses says that, "by The Beginning" Aleim formed the heaven and the earth, which had been previously brought into existence in another condition. And Solomon, speaking of this agent, says, "Jehovah possessed Me, the Beginning, his Way, the first of his works, from that particular point of time." The New Testament determines who this person was when he was manifested in the latter times to finish that work which he had undertaken before the earth was: and for which he had framed the different dispensations of the ages, (Heb. xi. 3, in the Greek) all of which took their rise in his Covenant engagements at least, if they did not originate from the date of his existence. This person was Jesus Christ. To illustrate his character was the design of John's Gospel. "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." In the Old Testament he is called "The Word." "By the Word of Jehovah were the heavens made, and all the hosts of them by the breath of his [the Word's] mouth": "by whom all things were made; and without whom was not any thing made that was made." And the Evangelist, after stating that "In the beginning was the Word," and to impress this information, which could never have entered into the imagination of men without a revelation from God, repeating his statement, expressly says, "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." From the sublime descriptions which are given of his origin and offices, many have been led to determine that he must be Jehovah of hosts. Yet notwithstanding their extraordinary grandeur and sublimity, they are all capable of harmonizing in the person of Jesus Christ, the Word, the First-born of every creature, without encroaching on the prerogatives of the Most High. For the certainty of his Creature-character we need only appeal to the contents of the chapter under consideration. The whole scope of it is to shew that Jesus Christ is the Word of God, and that this Jesus is as distinct in his Individual and essential character

from Jehovah, as he is shewn to be one in Essence with those to whom he came, and a distinct Individual of the species to which they belonged. He is described as coming unto his own *ἰδία*, and that his own, *ἰδιοί*, received him not. As dwelling among his disciples, and they beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father. Of him Nathaniel bare record that he was the Son of God, the King of Israel. Of him Nathaniel also bare witness that, in his Incarnate state he was that Person of whom Moses and the Prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth (as it was supposed) the Son of Joseph, the Lamb of God that was to take away the sin of the world. And as if the Apostle had determined to shut out all possibility of doubt concerning his being a Creature, the Word, a Man, in another place he has recorded, "That which was FROM THE BEGINNING, which (when partaker of flesh and blood) we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life—that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you."

But it is also said, "The Word was with God," *προς τον Θεον*. Nothing but a distinction of Individuality, and that distinction consisting in a diversity or separation in Essence of the parties which are declared to be found together, can be inferred from the preposition *προς*, whether its sense be collected from the use made of it by the profane or sacred authors. Demosthenes writes thus, *προς αυτον ποιειται*, "He treats with him." *Προς με παισαι*, "To play or sport with me." *εδεν κυτῳ προς την πολιν εσι*, "He has nothing to do with the city," i. e. its inhabitants. Xenophon has, *αγωνιζεσθαι προς τους ανδρας*, "We contend with the men." And Isocrates, *προς βασιλεα γενομεναι συνθημαι*, "A truce was made with the king." The sacred writers agree with the profane. Matt. xii. 56, "And his sisters are they not with us?" *προς ημας*. Chap. xxvi. 18, "I will keep the passover with thee," *προς σε*. Mark ix. 19, "How long shall I be with you?" *προς υμας*. Acts iii. 25, "Ye are the children of the cove-

nant which God made with our fathers," *προς τας πατερας ημων*. Rom. v. 1, "We have peace with God," *προς τον θεον*. The Creature-character of the Word, first established by the time of his origin being fixed, viz. "In the beginning," (for it is too great an absurdity to suppose that "In the beginning," can mean "From eternity," *i. e.* without beginning) is thus further confirmed by his asserting that there is a proximity of condition between the Word and God. But it will be urged, that however plausible this may be, the succeeding member, "And the Word was God," completely overthrows it. May it not with equal propriety be urged, that if the sense attributed to the preceding members is supported by the nature of things, and the testimony of the profane and sacred classics, there ought to be some suspicion that the last member is capable of another sense than that which is generally given to it? That this is the case will be seen in an attentive consideration of the elliptical character of the Holy Scriptures in both the Old and New Testament, viz.

Exod. vii. 1. "And Jehovah said unto Moses, See, I have made thee God [Aleim] to Pharoah.

1 Sam. xv. 23. "For the sin of witchcraft, rebellion; and iniquity and idolatry, stubbornness."

1 Kings iii. 7. "Thou hast made thy servant king instead of David my father: and I a little child."

Ps. xi. 1. "Flee a bird to your mountain."

— xxii. 6. "I a worm and not a man."

— lxxvii. 22. "I a beast before thee."

— cv. 41. "They ran in the dry places a river.

— cxxiv. 6. "Blessed be Jehovah, who has not given us a prey.

Is. xl. 6, 7. All flesh is grass—Surely the people grass."

Jer. i. 6. "Ah! Lord God! behold I cannot speak, for I a child."

Hos. xiv. 7. "They shall revive corn."

Will any one contend that nothing is wanting in these Scriptures, which are a literal translation of the Hebrew, to com-

plete the sense? There must be something more understood than is expressed. The Apostle Peter, in his first Epistle, chap. i. 24, furnishes a clue for them all. He there introduces the particle *ως*, "as," to express the meaning of the prophet Isaiah, chap. xl. 6, in the fulness designed by him.* "For all flesh is as grass." It is needless to remind the Greek scholar, that the New Testament abounds in Hebræisms. An author of high repute has observed, that "John's style is thought to be more idiomatical and less conformable to the syntactic order, than that of any other writer in the New Testament." The following passages in John's Gospel, &c. are similar to the text under discussion, and cannot be understood without a similar ellipsis.

Chap. vi. 48. "I am that bread of life."

x. 9. "I am the door."

x. 11. "I am the good Shepherd."

xiv. 6. "I am the vine, ye the branches."

Philemon 12. "Thou therefore receive him, that is mine own bowels."

Let the last member of chap. i. 1, be now considered as elliptical, and the ellipsis to be *ως* "as," and it will run, "And the Word was as God," in his place or stead. In the

* Parkhurst, in his Hebrew Lexicon, makes the following apposite remarks under the root אלה I. 5. "Ps. lxxxii. 5, *I have said ye are Aleim.*" In this text the word אלהים is indeed applied to earthly Magistrates or Judges, but that will never prove (as Gusset justly remarks) that the word itself properly signifies Judges or Magistrates; for thus in Is. xl. 7, it is said רועי העם *The people is grass*, yet no one would from hence infer that רועי (grass) signifies *people*: The Truth is, both expressions are only comparative or metaphorical. And as the latter denotes no more than that there is some resemblance between the people and grass, so the former imports only that there is a resemblance between earthly Judges and the supreme Aleim, whose Vicegerents they are, and with whose authority they are in some degree intrusted, so that in Ps. lxxxii. 6, the particle כ *like, as*, is to be understood before אלהים, just as it plainly is before רועי, Is. xl. 6, plainly I say, for though it is omitted in the former member of the sentence, it is expressed in the latter; *all flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof כציר is as the flower of the field.*"

same manner it must be understood in Exod. vii. 1, "And Jehovah said unto Moses, See I have made thee [as] God, Aleim, to Pharaoh." In this way all discordance is obviated, and that well known truth is confirmed, that Jesus Christ, the Word, "is the Image [something that is another than the thing represented] of the invisible God."

To sum up the whole. The first and second member of this verse, as they now stand in our translation, are inconsistent with the third. If the Word was not till the beginning, and was then with God, the Word cannot be God. And if the Word was God, then he cannot be said to be in the beginning and with God. Something must therefore be understood as elliptical in one of the members. No ellipsis is capable of being introduced into the first and second. Therefore it must be introduced into the third. And as the style of this Apostle not only favours the insertion of *as*, "as," but the instances in his Gospel are far from rare in which it is understood, the introduction of it in this place will not only remove contradiction from the face of the text, but make it harmonize with other Scriptures.* If the use of the ellipsis should be rejected, the reader is desired to consult pp. 109, 110, for the sense of *θεος* in the last clause of the first verse. If it stand for *μεσ*, "the Mediator," all will be clear. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with *θεος*, Aleim, God, and the Word was *θεος*, *μεσ*, the Mediator." Whether either of those sentiments are worthy the notice of the Biblical student, the reader will judge. Let him however pause before he determines to adopt the sense of the Received Version. If put in another and obvious point of view, will it not run thus? "In the beginning was God, and God was with God, and God was God." To this he will

* Christ's words in John vi. 48—51, confirm this view. He there declares that the manna with which Israel was fed in the wilderness was a type of him: "I am *as* that bread of life." And in Matt. xii. 50, "The same is *as* my brother, and *as* my sister, and *as* my mother."

hardly assent, as containing a fair transcript of the Apostle's mind and intention.

The fourteenth verse cannot be considered as presenting any difficulty after the preceding observations. The Word that was in the beginning, who was with God, even Jesus Christ of whom John bare witness, was being, *i. e.* beside what he was In the beginning, was Incarnate, or was of the seed of David according to the flesh, and so tabernacled *ἐσκηνοῦντο* among them of his own nation. From among these he chose some who were privileged to behold his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father. A glory which shone forth in his words, for never man spake as this man; and in his works, for it was never so seen in Israel. A glory which was more especially manifested to Peter, James, and John, who were eye witnesses of his majesty in the holy mount.

It would be sufficient to dismiss this verse with the few observations already made, but the first Advent of the Word or Messiah is expressed in such language as deserves more particular notice. It is here as elsewhere described by his taking a body or flesh. The spiritual part or Soul is never mentioned. The Outward Man only is spoken of. The Inward Man is mentioned in no one text of Scripture as forming a part of that new character or condition which the Messiah or Word assumed when he came to dwell on earth.* “The

* The writer is aware that this position will be considered as contradicted by many, as it is usually asserted, plain and positive Scriptures of the Old Testament. To these however he appeals for the confirmation of his assertion. He is convinced that the equivocal term “Soul,” by which *ψυχή* is rendered in our translation, has led many into this error: and that the word *ψυχή*, on which so much stress has been laid, has no reference to the immortal Spirit. *ψυχή* in its primary signification denotes the principle of existence whatever it is, and is a word of large extent or manifold application. It is predicated of Jehovah, *Lev. xvi. 11, 30. Prov. vi. 16. Is. i. 14. Jer. v. 9, 29. Amos vi. 8.* Also of Fish, *Is. xix. 10.*—Vegetables, *Is. x. 18.*—Idols, *Is. xlvi. 2.* as well as of Man. When applied to Man, it denotes not the immortal principle, but the animal life, or that frame or body in which it exists. *Gen. xii. 13.*

Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." "God sent forth his Son made [being] of a woman." "For as much as the children were partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part of the same." "In the days of his flesh he offered up prayers." "Wherefore coming into the world he saith, a body hast thou prepared me." "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God." "Many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." Could the Word or Messiah be a perfect Humanity without the Inward Man or Soul? Yet if the Word or Messiah was Jehovah, and Jehovah was Incarnate, this

"Say—thou art my sister, that it may be well with me for thy sake, and my Body **שׁוֹנֵן** shall live because of thee." See ch. xx. 11. Gen. xxxvii. 21. "Let us not kill him."—*Hebr.* "smite *his* Body," **נִכְנֹן נֶפֶשׁ**. Exod. i. 5, "All the Bodies **שׁוֹנֵן** that came out of the loins of Jacob, were seventy Bodies **שׁוֹנֵן**." Man can propagate only his animal frame. Lev. ii. 1, "And when any **שׁוֹנֵן** body or person shall offer a meat-offering." Ps. cv. 18, "He was laid in iron."—*Hebr.* "His Body **שׁוֹנֵן** came into iron."—*i. e.* was put into irons. Gen. xxxv. 18, "It came to pass, as her Animal soul **שׁוֹנֵן** was in departing, for she died." It was Rachael's animal or bodily life that ceased. In agreement with which we read, Matt. xxvi. 38, "My Soul **פֶּשַׁע** is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." This could not be the immortal Spirit. 1 Pet. iv. 19, "Let them that suffer according to the will of God, commit the keeping of their Souls **פֶּשַׁע** (their living bodies or bodily life, see Mark viii. 35.) to him in well doing." The reason why the Jews, when they had cast off their faith, made **שׁוֹנֵן** the immortal principle, was to prevent the sacrifices being understood typically. If it were the immortal spirit or principle which was to expiate sin, then the Brute-Creation could not be a type of Christ. Whereas let **שׁוֹנֵן** set forth the Animal life or Body in which it exists, then the killing of the Creature, whether Ox, Sheep, &c. was a typical exhibition of the great expiatory sacrifice in the person of Jesus Christ, upon which the sinner's hope is founded, and through which remission of sin is granted. It is owing to a misapprehension of the term **שׁוֹנֵן** as signifying the Animal soul or life, and the confounding it with the inward Man or the immortal principle of Man, that Christian teachers speak of the Immortal Soul or Spirit which Messiah took of the Virgin, for the purpose of making an offering of it upon the cross. Did the typical sacrifices exhibit such an offering as an immortal soul or spirit? Or can Animal Man propagate such a Being?

must be pronounced to be the case, for Scripture nowhere speaks of a spiritual part in union with the earthly house of that tabernacle which the Word took. Arians assert that the Word, *Λογος*, their created God, *θεος δευτερος*, animated the body of Messiah instead of a human soul. And Trinitarians, as long as they contend for the Incarnation of Jehovah, the true and only God of the Bible, must be pronounced, if we take the Scriptures for our guide, to labour justly under the imputation of a similar if not a greater absurdity, viz. of making the Uncreated and only God, Jehovah, animate the body of Messiah, certainly without, if not instead of, a Soul. Incidit in Scyllam, qui vult vitare Charybdim.*

2 Pet. iii. 5—7. "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the Word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same Word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men."

The language of the scoffers, not as in our translation of ver. 3, which adopts *εσχατων* the reading of some Manuscripts "in the last days," but "in the last of the days," *εσ' εσχατου των ημερων*, or in that time which shall immediately

* The Arian view of the Incarnation is, that the Word, the Son of God, animated the body prepared for him: so that the Saviour had not a human soul, but that the Word, the Son of God, supplied the place of a soul. The New Testament speaks of the Lord Jesus Christ when on the earth as a Man. By this we can understand no other than a being subsisting of an Inward Man and an Outward Man, or Soul and Body. But if a Spirit of a superior order animated the body of Jesus Christ he was not a Man. And it is moreover inconsistent with the works of God, that any other than a human soul should animate a human body. It would disturb that harmony and beautiful gradation which is universally established, if a Spirit should have a body given to it which is any other than its appropriate body. Were this, could this be so, no species of existence would stand distinct from the rest. Every order might be found to infringe on the province or capacities of another. Relation and proportion must be confessed to be necessary, or a general confusion will inevitably follow.

precede the second Advent of Messiah,* is according to Peter, that since the death of the first inhabitants of the earth all things have continued as they were constituted at the Formation, or when Chaos was reduced to order. But the Apostle declares, that they were wilfully ignorant of the great change that had taken place in the condition of the earth and of those who dwelt thereon at the deluge, and therefore intentionally shut their eyes against another threatened desolation equally certain and complete in its effects, though dissimilar in its way of manifesting God's wrath against a perverse and crooked generation. Setting aside the revelation which Jehovah had made by Moses and the prophets, viz. that the earth had been removed, that the mountains had been carried into the midst of the sea, and that all in whose nostrils was the breath of life had died at a general flood, the Exuviae of the creatures which then perished, and are every where dispersed over the face, or to be found in the bowels of the earth, are ever sufficient to prove to natural men, that such a catastrophe had taken place, and that the same power which had produced it would not suffer his wrath to sleep when again provoked. Such men may, for the purpose of evading the conclusion which a conscience not quite seared is ever forcing upon them, deny what the testimony of their own senses fully evidences. They may disregard the voice of God, and the rebukes of conscience, yet the Lord reserveth "the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." But Peter's intention was not only to denounce the vengeance which would overtake all ungodly scoffers at the appointed time, but espe-

* Jude speaks of the same men and of the same period with Peter in this place, and in almost the same words. The language of Jude with respect to the time is *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις* "in the last time," of Peter *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν ἡμερῶν*, "in the last of the days": These Apostles specifying by the words "last time," "the last days," a part of that aggregate period called in Scripture, "Last times," "Last days"; and which was to form the close of that particular period. Our version has confounded this passage of Peter, disregarding the clue which Jude afforded, with others which speak of times and events that precede and are preparatory to "the last of the days," i. e. to the appearing of Messiah and the setting up of his kingdom upon earth at the time of the end.

cially to establish the pre-eminence of that Master whose servant and Apostle he was. Like John, who had been an eye-witness together with himself of his majesty in the holy mount; in speaking of him he makes use of that peculiar name or title by which he had been well known to the fathers—when they attributed to him, as the agent of Jehovah, those several works of love and mercy by which the people of God were so highly exalted, and of power by which his enemies were so often confounded. It was by The Word, he says, that the heavens and the earth were of old: that the Word, who had separated between the waters that were above the earth, and the waters that were under the earth, by those waters overflowed the earth, and for a time marred that beautiful and harmonious arrangement of the terraqueous globe which he had produced. It is by the same Word, he declares that the heavens and the earth which now are, having been restored after the deluge, are kept in store for a second destruction by fire. How uniform and consistent is the language of Scripture! “God formed all things by Jesus Christ.” “By him, the first-born of every creature, were all things formed that are in heaven and that are in earth.” By him “also he appointed or fixed the ages” during which they should subsist. It is he, who is “upholding all things by the word of his power” during these several dispensations. It is he, who when he shall have pronounced their termination, saying, “It is done,” shall manifest “that fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries.” “For God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by *that* Man whom he hath ordained.” “Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble” his servants, “when the Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

1 John i. 1—3. “That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes,

which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life: (for the life was manifested, and we have seen *it*, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father and was manifested unto us:) that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you."

This Scripture has been already so often noticed, that it may seem superfluous to speak again of its authority in establishing the point before us. But there is an ambiguity in the English translation of the preposition *περὶ*, as well as a want of perspicuity in that of the relative pronoun *ὅς*, from its not being rendered in the subsequent members with the same fulness as in the beginning of the chapter, and from its being unnecessarily translated by a Word which is of the neuter gender. The following is therefore given as expressing the original more accurately, and leading more immediately to him who is the subject matter of it. "Him who was from the beginning, him whom we have heard, him whom we have seen with our eyes, him whom we have looked upon; and our hands have handled: *we speak of or concerning the Word of life: (for the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us:) him whom we have seen and heard declare we unto you.*" Our translators appear to have had some scruple in rendering the neuter *ὅς* by a masculine pronoun, notwithstanding it would have been justified by the noun *Λόγος* to which it undoubtedly refers, as well as by the character of the person whom it describes. It is most probable that viewing him as One of the Trine-Plurality, they thought that gender was more expressive of his dignity, than one which might identify him with a creature. If, however, what has been advanced on the subject of the Creature-character of the *Λόγος* is consistent with Scripture, they have erred in this. And the apparent difficulty of the neuter relative pronoun affords an additional confirmation of the truth already sufficiently proved: viz. that the term *Λόγος* is intended to set forth Messiah, the Pre-ex-

istent Son, and Fellow (עמית "associate") of Jehovah before the world was: whom when manifested in the flesh as his Servant and Prophet, they heard, saw, and handled with their hands. "Of" or "concerning" him the Apostle spake. And to make this appear more evident, it is necessary not only that the ambiguity of the preposition "Of," which is most generally considered as denoting the genitive case, should be removed, but that the ellipsis should be supplied by some such words as "We Speak."

But the neuter relative O' is too important to be dismissed without some further observations. The distinction of sex can have nothing to do with that which constitutes the Essence of Man, or which establishes his identity in heaven and in earth. The woman that was given to the seven brethren was to be the wife of none of them in another state of being, for marriage, which is founded on the diversity of sex, will have no existence there. All will be as the Angels of God in heaven, partaking of no variation in this respect. In Christ there is neither male nor female. Messiah was One who was chosen out of the people. He and they, in what constitutes their humanity, must therefore be alike. The Head, who was anointed as a Prophet to make known God's will to his people, as a Priest to make atonement for their sins, and as a King to reign over them for ever and ever, must be the same with the Body, for they are all One. Before his incarnation Messiah must have been, what he will be when he shall have gathered his people in one, and translated them into the glories of heaven, i. e. neither Male nor Female. The neuter O' is therefore peculiarly expressive of him, as what he was from the beginning, and may with propriety be rendered by that English term which describes the character that he assumed when he took part of flesh and blood.* "Him who was from the beginning," &c.

* It may be positively pronounced that there exists no distinction of sex in the Inward Man of them who are now so distinguished outwardly. But in speaking of them after the Inward Man or what constitutes their

1 John v. 7. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost : and these three are one."

The studious and critical part of the Christian World, vary but little in their opinion concerning the real character of this text. To them it is a matter of the clearest proof that it is found in no ancient Greek or Latin manuscript, and that it is cited by no early Greek or Latin writer. It was not generally admitted into the editions of the New Testament after the Reformation. Luther omitted it in his German translation : and the earliest of the English versions marked its doubtful character, either by a variation of the type or by inclosing it in brackets. Since that time the want of uniformity of sentiment on this point among the members of the English Church is well known, though the text has been long made a part of the received translation. Some of its prelates who are no more, have pronounced it to be spurious. Whoever was the author of this forgery, or with what design he executed it, the effects have been long as notorious as they are to be lamented. From the supposed assertion of the Godhead of the Word in this place, the several passages in which the term is found, have, in spite of contradiction to the obvious meaning of the context, been pronounced to speak of one of the Trine-Plurality in which Jehovah has revealed himself. The supposed paramount testimony of this passage in due time carried away before it in one common wreck all that the evidence of the Hebrew Scriptures, that the construction of the Greek language, that antiquity and common sense, as well as just criticism, have afforded, to prove the Word to be a Man. The circumstance of identifying Messiah with one of the Trine-Plurality, *i. e.* the corporifying Jehovah, or making him Incarnate, most probably led the way to this pious fraud. Its author seeing no Scripture in which the term Word was con-

identity, a distinction is necessary on account of the variation in the tabernacles which they inhabit : so a grammatical distinction of sex became unavoidable.

fessedly applied to One of the Trine-Plurality; and having, as it is generally supposed, placed it in the margin to express his opinion of the necessity as well as propriety of some such Ellipsis, it was by a less scrupulous hand interpolated after the sixth verse. From ignorance of its origin or from its apparent agreement with the Orthodox standard, it was soon deemed, as it continues still to be by almost every professor of Christianity, a part of the original. The restoration of such words as בָּרָא, *αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν, γινώσκων*, "create"; of נֶצַח, *עוֹלָם, עוֹלָם, קדָם, αἰῶς, αἰών*, "World"; of "Son of God," &c. to their Scriptural meaning; the ascertaining in what the Humanity consists; and that Incarnation is never predicated of Jehovah; prepare the Bible-student for a rejection of 1 John v. 7, as a forgery, before he is made acquainted with those arguments which history furnishes to prove its spurious character. And these arguments in their turn, by removing from Scripture the only text in which the term "Word" is unequivocally applied to Jehovah as One of the Trine-Plurality, tend to corroborate the exposition given to those passages, in which the Saviour as a Man is plainly asserted to have a Pre-existence, and against which early prejudices alone are found to militate.*

* There are two texts in the English version which contribute to establish the error here combated. From the known integrity of the translators no suspicion can rest upon them as intending to mislead; but such has been the consequence of their inattention to the rendering of *λογος* in Heb. i. 3—xi. 3. In the former we read, "Who being the brightness of *his* glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the Word *ἐν ᾧ* of his power." In the latter, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the Word *ἐν ᾧ* of God." In both instances the term "Word" is made to represent the Greek *λογος*. And these Scriptures are generally quoted in proof of the Deity of the "Word," or *Λογος*, when in truth all that is expressed is the "Command" of him who is spoken of: and in both texts this person is the Son, the First-born of every creature. He upholds all things by his "powerful command." He constituted or fixed the duration of *αιῶνες* the "ages," not the "worlds." A third and not less notable error occurs in Acts xviii. 15, "If it be a question of words and names," &c. Whereas it is in the original, "If it be a question of the Word *λογος* *καὶ* *ὀνόματα*,"

In the following references which are made concerning the term *Λογος*, to the writings of men that have not the stamp of Divine authority, nothing more is intended than to shew, that the idea of creature-ship in connection with him who bears this name is not of modern date. It must be allowed that with the creature-characters which are given by these authors to the *Λογος*, there are found titles that appear to attribute something more. It is immaterial on the present occasion whether these seeming contradictions arose from a misunderstanding of the real import of the words *θεος*, *κτιστος*, &c. or from a reception of that strange opinion of Jehovah's Incarnation, current at an early period of the Christian æra. Both these points have been already fully considered. And as appeal is made to Scripture alone in these pages for the establishment of any doctrine, it would be only loss of time to enter now into a further discussion of these subjects.

The author of the Apocryphal book intitled the "Wisdom of Solomon," supposed by some to be Philo, who lived when Onias was High Priest, about one hundred and sixty years before Christ, writes thus, "O God of my fathers, and Lord of mercy, who hast made *ο-ποιησας* all things by *εν* thy Word," ch. ix. 1. "For it was neither herb, nor mollifying plaister, that restored them to health, but thy Word, O Lord, which healeth all things." ch. xvi. 12. "Thine Almighty Word leaped down from heaven, out of thy royal throne, as a fierce

and names, and of your law, look ye to it, for I will be no judge of such matters." Gallio refers their points of religious controversy to the Jews, reserving what related to civil matters only for his own decision. The essential character of the "Word" or *Λογος* was a leading point in the creed of the Jewish, as it is of the Christian Church. How came our Translators to disregard it in this place? It is impossible consistently with their indisputable claims to piety to impute it to design. But while the frailty of our common nature requires us to say what Christian charity prompts, "Peradventure it was an oversight," the cause of Truth demands that we should add, "Cease from man, wherein is he to be accounted of?"

man of war, into the midst of a land of destruction, and brought thine unfeigned commandment as a sharp sword, and standing up filled all things with death, and it touched the heaven, but it stood upon the earth." ch. xviii. 15, 16. Of Wisdom, another appellation of him who is termed *Λογος*, the author of the Book intitled Ecclesiasticus writes thus. "Wisdom hath been created *ἐκτισαι* before all things." ch. i. 4. "He created *ἐκτίσσει* me from the beginning, before the world, and I shall never fail. In the holy tabernacle I served before him: and so was I established in Zion." ch. xxiv. 9, 4.

But the writings of the latter Philo, who flourished in the reigns of Caligula and Claudius, are so full on this point, and are quoted by so many Christian Divines, that the Biblical student need only to be reminded of some few of the titles which he gives to the *Λογος*, to be able to appreciate his sentiments on this subject. He calls the *Λογος*, "The First begotten Son." Edit. Colonise Allobrogum, 1663, p. 152. B. "The Son of God before the angels." p. 397, F. G. "The first begotten Word." p. 267, B. "The eldest Angel." p. 267, B. "The Archangel of many names." p. 267, B. "The Beginning." p. 267, B. "The Image of God." p. 267, C. "By whom God made the world as by an instrument." p. 60, C. "The Former of all things in the worlds." p. 258, A. "The Governour of the world." p. 87, G. "The Seer of Israel." p. 267, G. "The Man of God." p. 255, D. "The High Priest of God." p. 463, F. "The Mediator between God and man." p. 397, F. G. "Who makes God propitious to his creatures." p. 398, A. B. "Not unbegotten as God, nor begotten as we are." p. 398, A. He says, that it was the *Λογος* who appeared to Adam, Abram, Jacob, Hagar, Moses, Balaam, to the Elders of Israel on Sinai, and who led Israel through the Wilderness. It is not probable that he derived these terms or this information from any Greek writers. He might possibly have obtained them from the Targums of Onkelos or Jonathan, a few years after whom he

lived, but his ignorance of both the Chaldee and Hebrew languages makes this improbable. But from whatever source he derived his knowledge on these topics, his expressions have been quoted with a view only to shew that the creature-character of the Λόγος was no novelty in the days in which he lived.

CHAPTER VII.

WHEN we contemplate the powers of the human mind with respect to its penetration into the secrets of nature, and its sagacity in detecting error in the various deductions made by the theoretical or practical philosopher, it appears improbable that any subject should occur in which they can be altogether impotent. The men of this world reject the thought with disdain. The comprehensive and mighty grasp which they have, in laying hold of and appropriating to their use whatever is in the heights above and in the depths below, makes them in the pride of their heart to determine that they can exercise themselves in no matter that is too great or too high for them. There are things, however, which are hid from the wise and prudent: the things of God, the things that accompany salvation. Of these matters "it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent." On these points it is asked by one who had been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous towards God, "Where is the wise?" "Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" But it is not such men alone who evince the truth of a position so mortifying to human pride. Many, who afford ample testimony that they have set their affections on things above, and not on things on the earth, when they lean to their own understanding, manifest in the decisions which they give upon the topics that remain to be discussed, the incompetency of the powers of the human mind to attain any spiritual know-

ledge without divine aid. By imputing a signification, or by attributing a sense to certain names given to the Redeemer, which either the words cannot bear, or the context disproves, they have not only unhappily perplexed the faith and undermined the comfort of the true believer, but have justly provoked the sneer of the sinner, and in many instances helped to rivet the fetters of Infidelity. When the unscriptural application of these names shall be considered, and the obstacles that they oppose to the doctrine which these pages are intended to establish, are removed, the reader will be introduced to the consideration of those Scriptures which speak immediately of the Pre-existence of the "One Mediator between God and men, the Man Jesus Christ."

The terms "Jesus," "Christ," taken singly, or in connection "Jesus Christ," are with a most strange perversion and ill timed confidence applied to Jehovah, as pointing to him immediately in the glorious work of salvation, instead of his Son, his Prophet, the First-born of every creature, of whom Moses and the prophets did speak. It is intended to rest the proof of this on the testimony of a few out of the many texts which lie scattered throughout the sacred volume. Some leading words in each will be found in small capitals to direct the reader's attention to the subject in question, and a few brief remarks will be occasionally made upon them. And if a single eye, and a singleness of heart shall accompany the perusal of them, it will not be presumptuous to expect, that the idea, which is so commonly entertained through the pre-judgment derived from education, that these terms are intended to designate Jehovah Incarnate, will appear to be founded rather on the bias which has been given by our Instructors, than on the information which the Sacred Oracles are calculated to convey.

The Scriptures which follow are quoted in the order of the Books of the New Testament, and are designed to set forth the testimony of the Gentiles, of the Jews, of the Redeemer's disciples, and of Himself, that the terms "Jesus," "Christ,"

and "Jesus Christ," belong to the first and most glorious of the human race: and that they have and can have no allusion to Jehovah, but are in opposition or in contradistinction to him.

The name JESUS is indicative of a Man, and has no allusion to Jehovah.*

1. According to the testimony of the Gentiles.

Luke xxiii. 13, 14. "And Pilate—said unto them, Ye have brought THIS MAN ["Jesus" ver 8.] unto me, as one that perverteth the people: and behold, I, having examined *him* before you, have found no fault in THIS MAN touching those things whereof ye accuse him."

John iv. 26, 28, 29. "Jesus saith unto her, I that speak

* The advocates for the doctrine of the Incarnation of Jehovah have rested their opinion principally on the word Jesus as having the signification of "Jehovah the Saviour." It is, they say, a Hebrew name, יהושע, "Jehoshuah" or "Joshua," with which "Jesus" corresponds according to Acts vii. 45, Heb. iv. 8, compounded of יה "Jah," and הושע "he causeth to save," or, "is a Saviour." Such may be the Etymology of the name given to the Redeemer, but it no more proves him to be Jah or Jehovah incarnate, than the name of ישעיהו "Isaiah"—ישע "hath saved"—יה "Jah": or ירמיהו "Jeremiah"—ירם "shall exalt"—יה "Jah": or עובדיהו "Obadiah"—עבד "is serving"—יה "Jah": or צפניהו "Zephaniah"—צפן "hath hid"—יה "Jah": or זכריהו "Zechariah"—זכר "hath remembered"—יה "Jah": or any other name similarly compounded proves, that the person to whom it was given was Jehovah in the flesh. But it is not necessary that יה "Jah" should be considered as entering into the composition of the name יהושע "Jesus." Many nouns both Proper and Appellative are formed by prefixing י to the verbal form, as יעקב, ילקוט. And יהושע may be formed in the same way—from הושע and the prefixed י. The language of Beza, an unexceptionable witness on the Orthodox side, is couched in these strong words, referring to the "Name of Jesus," in Phil ii. 9, 10. Quòd enim Osiander hoc ad ipsum nomen Jesu, quod ipse confundit cum Jehovah, merum est insanientis hominis delirium, "As to what Osiander asserts on the Name of Jesus, which he confounds with Jehovah, it is the mere raving of a mad man." And again on Heb. iv. 8. Ut planè sint ridiculi qui Jesu nomen, cum Christo tribuitur, volunt ad nomen Jehovah detorquere. "How manifestly absurd are they, who are disposed to wrest the Name of Jesus, when it is given to Christ, to make it of the same signification with Jehovah."

unto thee am *he*. The woman then left her water pot, and went her way into the city, and saith to THE MEN, Come see A MAN which told me all things that ever I did."

John xviii. 29. "Pilate then went out unto them, and said, what accusation bring ye against THIS MAN ["Jesus" ver. 28.]?"

John xix. 5. "Then came Jesus forth, wearing the crown of thorns, and the purple robe. And *Pilate* saith unto them, Behold THE MAN."

2. According to the testimony of the Jews.

Matt. xiii. 54—57. "And when he ["Jesus" ver. 53.] was come into his own country, he taught them in the synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished, and said, whence hath THIS *Man* *την* this wisdom and these mighty works? Is not THIS *εστις* the carpenter's son? Is not HIS MOTHER called Mary? And his BRETHREN, James and Joses, and Simon and Judas? And his SISTERS, are they not all with us? Whence then hath THIS *Man* *την* all these things? And they were offended in him. But Jesus said unto them, A PROPHET is not without honour save in his own country and in his own house."

Luke i. 31, 42, 43. "And behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name Jesus.—And she spake out with a loud voice, and said, blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the FRUIT of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the MOTHER of my Lord should come to me?"

If the male child conceived in the womb of the Virgin, if the fruit of her womb born into this world called Jesus, was not the embodying of the Soul or the corporifying of the Inward Man, but the Incarnation of Jehovah, then Mary must have been, what every Protestant church exclaims against as something worse than nonsense, the Mother of Jehovah or God.

Luke ii. 21—23. "And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the CHILD his name was called Jesus,

which was so named of the angel before he was CONCEIVED in the womb. And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem to PRESENT HIM TO THE LORD: As it is written in the law of the Lord, Every MALE that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord."

John v. 12, 15. "Then asked they him, WHAT MAN is that which said unto thee, Take up thy bed and walk? And he that was healed wist not who it was: for Jesus had conveyed himself away, a multitude being in that place. Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple and said unto him, Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more lest a worse thing come unto thee. The man departed and told the Jews that it was JESUS which had made him whole."

John vii. 14, 25, 46. "Now about the midst of the feast Jesus went up into the temple and taught. Then said some of them of Jerusalem, Is not this he whom they seek to kill? The officers answered, Never MAN spake like THIS MAN."

John ix. 11, 16, 24. "He answered and said, A MAN that is called Jesus made clay and anointed mine eyes, and said unto me, Go to the pool of Siloam and wash; and I went and washed and I received sight. Therefore said some of the Pharisees, THIS MAN is not of God, because he keepeth not the sabbath day. Others said, how can A MAN that is a sinner do such miracles? And there was a division among them. Then again called they THE MAN that was blind and said unto him, Give God the praise: we know that THIS MAN is a sinner."

Acts v. 28. "Did we not strictly command you that ye should not teach in this name ["Jesus" ver. 30]? And behold ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to bring THIS MAN'S BLOOD upon us."

These texts establish an Individuality of the human species both in soul and body as belonging to Jesus, and are therefore in opposition to the Incarnation of Jehovah, or to the

doctrine of **Two Natures, Divine and Human, making One Person.**

3. According to the testimony of his Disciples.

Matt. xxvi. 69, 74, 72. "Now Peter sat without in the palace, and a damsel came unto him saying, Thou also wast with **JESUS** of Galilee.—Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, I know not **THE MAN**. And again he denied with an oath, I do not know **THE MAN**."

Two damsels, one in the palace of the high priest, and another in the porch of the palace, charged Peter with being a companion of Jesus. Whom did they consider Jesus to be? It will not be contended that they had a higher opinion of his character than Peter. And he again and again declares that he was a **MAN**, "I do not know the **MAN**." "I know not the **MAN**."

Luke xxiv. 19—27. "And he said unto them, what things? And they said unto him, concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a **PROPHET** mighty in deed and word **BEFORE GOD** and all the people: And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have **CRUCIFIED HIM**. But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and besides all this, to day is the third since these things were done. Yea and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre; And when they found not **HIS BODY**, they came saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was **ALIVE**. And certain of them that were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even as he had said: but him they saw not. Then he said unto them, O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! ought not Christ to have **SUFFERED** these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at **Moses** and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

The language of these two disciples to Jesus is too plain to be misunderstood. They call him a prophet, and a prophet

highly honoured of God, mighty in deed and word in the presence of God, *ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ*.* They speak of him as one who had been crucified, and whose dead body had, as they supposed, been taken by stealth from the sepulchre where it had been laid. Does Jesus dissent to any part of this account as it relates to himself? Does he not on the contrary upbraid them for their ignorance of that which the sacred books had recorded should happen to him: viz. that he, the Christ, distinguishing himself from GOD, must suffer all these things, but that they would be only preparatory to his rising on the third day, and entering into his glory, which glory he had with the Father before the world was? Does he not refer them to Moses and the prophets, who spake of him as the seed of the woman, the Virgin's Son; as the seed of Abraham in whom all the nations of the earth should be blessed; as the prophet whom Jehovah Aleim should raise up unto the children of Israel of their brethren like unto himself? Can more distinct marks of Humanity be given? Can a more separate character and Individuality from Jehovah be well described?

John i. 29, 30. "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the LAMB OF GOD, which taketh away the sin of the world. This is he of whom I said, After me cometh A MAN which is preferred before me: for he was before me."

If the character of Jesus as the Lamb of God be considered in connection with the language of the Old, and the subsequent parts of the New Testament, nothing can be more clear than that a Man, in his complex character of soul and body, is spoken of. Isaiah declares that he, who "is

* With whatever propriety *ἔναντιον* may be rendered "before," "in the presence of," this sense can be given to it only as it signifies some thing or person placed or considered in opposition to, or distinguished from another. This would have sufficiently marked the distinction between God and Jesus, and pointed to their separate Individuality, if the words "prophet," "suffered," "alive," had not made it hardly possible to confound them.

brought as a Lamb to the slaughter," is "a Man אִישׁ of sorrows, despised and rejected of men," אִישִׁים. Philip applies Isaiah's words to Jesus, when he expounded them to the Eunuch, as speaking not of the prophet, but "of some other Man." And Peter, speaking of redemption as obtained only by the "blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot," asserts that Jesus "his own self [distinguishing between his Inward and Outward Man] bare our sins in his own body on the tree." But if there could be any doubt of the force of the figurative expression in John i. 29, as applying to the body in opposition to the soul, to the Outward as distinguished from the Inward Man, the next verse would effectually remove it. "This is he of whom I said, After me cometh A MAN who is preferred before me, for he [the Inward Man] was before me." See Ch. VIII. under John i. 14, 15, 29, 30. The preceding part of this chapter confirms the testimony of the Baptist in a manner not usually noticed. "There was a Man sent from God whose name was John: the same came for a witness of the Light. He was not that Light." Here the Man John is expressly said to be "not that Light," who is before called "The Word." Of course he plainly says, that The Word, The Light, was also a Man, or how could the Man John be possibly mistaken for him? The subsequent language of the Baptist is equally explicit. "And this is the record of John, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed and denied not, but confessed, I am not the Christ": a Creature, as the word itself fully proves. When they further "asked him, What then?" If not the Man Christ, "Art thou" the Man "Elias?" Again "he saith, I am not."

Acts ii. 22—24. "Ye Men of Israel, hear these words: JESUS of Nazareth, A MAN approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which GOD did BY HIM in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of

God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: WHOM GOD hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it."

4. According to the testimony of Jesus himself.

Matt. xx. 23. "He ["Jesus," ver. 25.] saith unto them, —to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but *it shall be given to them* for whom it is prepared of my Father."

John v. 19, 26, 31. "Then answered Jesus and said,—As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.—I can of myself do nothing; as I hear, I judge; and my judgment is just: because I seek not my own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me."

John xx. 17. "Jesus saith unto her—I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God."

If the origin of power as existing in another, and a distinction of will as differing from another, mark a difference and distinction between Two, then Jesus cannot be the same as the Father, according to the two first quotations. And, if a sameness of relation subsists between the disciples of Jesus and God, as between Jesus and God, then, according to the last quotation, Jesus and his disciples must have a common relationship subsisting between them: or in other words the name of Jesus is indicative of a Man only, and can have no allusion to God.

The name CHRIST is indicative of a Man, and has no allusion to Jehovah.*

* In reply to the assertion so commonly made, that the term Christ is a name given to Jehovah, it may be urged, that the following addition may be made to the many Scripture proofs already adduced, that it indicates no more than an appointment to an office, or the qualifying or empowering one invested with office to act therein, and that he who bare that name in Scripture was a Man, and a Man only, viz. the Man who is before all things, the Word who with the Father in the beginning, and who in the fulness of the time was Incarnate. Isaiah, ch. lxi. 1, says, "The Spirit of the Lord God [אֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה] "The Ruler Jehovah,"] is upon

1. According to the testimony of the Gentiles.

Matt. ii. 4. "And when he [Herod] had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where CHRIST should be BORN."

Luke xxiii. 39, 47. "And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him, saying, If thou be CHRIST, save thyself and us.—Now when the Centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, certainly this was a righteous MAN."

John iv. 25, 29, 41, 42. "The woman saith unto him, I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come he will tell us all things.—Come see A MAN which told me all things that ever I did: Is not this the CHRIST?—And many more believed because of his own word; And said unto the woman, now we believe, not because of thy saying; for we have HEARD HIM ourselves, and know that THIS is indeed THE CHRIST, the Saviour of the world."

2. According to the testimony of the Jews.

me, because Jehovah יהוה hath anointed me to preach," &c. And Luke referring to this passage, ch. iv. 16—21, says, that "Jesus stood up to read in the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias, and when he had opened the book and found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach,—he closed the Book,—and began to say, This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." In the Old Testament the speaker says, "Jehovah hath anointed me": therefore Jehovah could not be the one anointed, the Messiah or Christ. And in the New Testament it is said of Jesus, that after he had been tempted of the devil to deny the Lord his God, he applied the words of Isaiah to himself as the One whom Jehovah had anointed or made Christ, and therefore could not be Jehovah. "He hath anointed me." Luke iv. 18. And David by the Spirit says, "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Ps. xlv. 7. Which words Paul quotes in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. i. 9, applying them to Jesus, and making it evident, that not only he who was anointed of God, could not be God, but that he being declared to have a superior unction to his fellows must be one of the people out of whom he was chosen, and over whom he had the pre-eminence in this as in every other respect.

tures declare that a Man is the Mediator between God and men, 1 Tim. ii. 5.) to God even the Father, will he cease to be? If not he must then have a distinct and separate Individuality. And what he shall have then, he must have had when exercising the office of Mediator. The obvious inquiry therefore is, what becomes of Jehovah's Incarnation, or the doctrine of One Person in Two Natures.* The Incarnation of the Divine Essence, according to those who defend the doctrine, deprives it of none of its distinguishing and essential characters. Why should the manifestation of the Divine in the Human nature destroy, as is asserted by them who maintain that view, what is the distinguishing and essential characteristic of the Human Nature, viz. Individuality? It is in vain to look for a Human Nature without an Individual or Personal character. The idea of such a thing has nothing on which it can be founded from Adam to the present moment. (See Note at p. 148.)

Heb. ix. 28. "So CHRIST was once OFFERED to bear the sins of many."

1 Pet. iii. 18. "For CHRIST also hath once SUFFERED for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to DEATH in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit."

In these and similar Scriptures, where sufferings, death, &c. are applied to Jesus, and to Christ, it is urged that such things are not predicated of Jehovah, but of the human na-

* When we speak of the Divine Nature, do we not mean, though not without the greatest impropriety, for how can Nature, *ex nasci*, be predicated of Deity, God himself? *i. e.* his Individuality, as Jehovah the one true and only living God? Do we not mean what is incommunicably his, and cannot be attributed to another without multiplying the Godhead, or virtually saying, There be Gods many? And is it not the same with respect to the Human Nature? Can it be spoken of otherwise than signifying an Individual of that part of God's works called Man? Does it not mean what is peculiar to him, not only in contradiction to every other existence of the animal world, but to every other being in the scale of Entity? And if attributed to another, does it not necessarily multiply the species of that genus to which Man belongs?

ture which he assumed. But is this meeting the point at issue fairly? If Jehovah took flesh, that flesh is himself while Incarnate. The Patripassians thought so, and argued on that impression. It behoves those who oppose their heresy to steer clear of what will involve them in the same condemnation. The Patripassian is consistent while he maintains his error. The Trinitarian who asserts the Incarnation of Jehovah, yet denies that he suffered, bled, and died, is guilty of a manifest contradiction.*

* A similar remark may be made equally to the disadvantage of what is called the Orthodox Creed, if the doctrine of the Metempsychosis be considered. It is justly observed, that, if the boundaries by which the different orders of beings are distinguished and limited, may be disregarded and overstepped at pleasure, for the purpose of establishing doctrines which the ingenuity or perverseness of the human mind shall pretend to discover, nothing decisive can be determined concerning any order of existences. Confusion and perplexity must pervade the works of Jehovah. The presence or absence, nay the very existence, of any rank or class of beings cannot be pronounced with certainty, if the Outward Form prescribed to each description of creatures may be made the receptacle for one of an essence altogether heterogeneous. But while the orthodox, in common with all others, thus reprobate the absurdities and contradictions of the Metempsychosian creed, they do not perceive, that they are not only guilty of a similar, but of a far greater, yea of the greatest possible aberration, from consistency as well as truth. To bring the Spirit of a higher order of existences from another world and unite with the body of a beast, that it may undergo punishment for sins committed in another and its appropriate body, excites both pity and abhorrence. The Christian world has universally condemned the outrage upon all feeling and propriety of which the advocates of this opinion have been guilty, in their monstrous attempts to unite natures so opposite and contradictory as the rational and the irrational creation. No discordance however is seen or apprehended in bringing down Jehovah, the Father of Spirits, from heaven to dwell on earth, united to, or rather embodied in a tabernacle of one of the human species, or as they say invested with a human nature, for the purpose of expiating sins which not He but his creature Man committed. The investigation of truth is most earnestly to be desired. A zealous defence of it when attacked is at all times a bounden duty. But before we can hope to promote its advancement among the adversaries, we must steer clear of those numerous absurdities, inconsistencies, and contradictions, which we meet at every turn, and condemn upon every occasion in others. Truth

4. According to the testimony of Christ himself.

Matt. xxii. 41—45. “While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them saying, What think ye of CHRIST? Whose Son is he? They say unto him, *The Son of DAVID*. He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If DAVID then call him Lord, how is he HIS SON?”

Matt. xxiv. 4, 5. “And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you. For MANY shall come in my name, saying, I am CHRIST; and shall deceive many.”

Mark xii. 35—37. “And Jesus answered and said, while he taught in the temple, how say the Scribes that CHRIST is THE SON OF DAVID? For David himself said by the Holy Ghost, the Lord [Jehovah] said to my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool. DAVID therefore himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he *then* HIS SON?”

Luke xxiv. 26, 46. “Ought not CHRIST to have SUFFERED these things, and to enter into his glory? Thus it is written and thus it behoved CHRIST to SUFFER, and to rise from the dead the third day.”

The names JESUS and CHRIST, taken in connection are indicative of a Man, and have no allusion to Jehovah.

1. According to the testimony of the Gentiles.

Matt. xxvii. 15—26. “Now at *that* feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would. And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas. Therefore when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or JESUS which is called CHRIST? For he knew that for envy they had delivered him. When he was sat

mixed with error, designedly or not, or truth tortured into error by ingenuity or blind obstinacy, will invariably be found to confirm the gainsayer in the error of his ways.

down on the judgment seat his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with **THAT JUST MAN**: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him. But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask **Barabbas** and **DESTROY JESUS**. The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said **Barabbas**. Pilate said unto them, What then shall I do with **JESUS** which is called **CHRIST**? They all say unto him, Let him be **CRUCIFIED**. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying let him be **CRUCIFIED**. When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the **BLOOD OF THIS JUST PERSON**: See ye to it. Then answered all the people and said, **HIS BLOOD** be on us and on our children. Then released he **Barabbas** unto them: and when he had **SCOURGED JESUS** he delivered him to be **CRUCIFIED**."

2. According to the testimony of the Jews.

Acts xix. 4, 5. "Then said Paul, **John** verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on **HIM** which should **COME AFTER HIM**," (See **Ch. VIII.** under **John i. 14, 15, 29, 30.**) that is, on **CHRIST JESUS**. "When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord **Jesus**."

3. According to the testimony of his Disciples.

Rom. i. 3. "Concerning his Son **JESUS CHRIST** our Lord, which was made of the **SEED** of **DAVID** according to the flesh."

Rom. ii. 16. "**GOD** shall judge the secrets of men by **JESUS CHRIST**."

Rom. v. 15. "But not as the offence so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of **GOD**, and the gift by grace, which is by **ONE MAN, JESUS CHRIST**, hath abounded unto many."

1 John i. 7. "But if we walk in the light as he is in the

light, we have fellowship one with another, and **THE BLOOD** of **JESUS CHRIST** his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Rev. i. 1. "The Revelation of **JESUS CHRIST**, which God gave unto him."

4. According to the testimony of Jesus Christ himself.

Matt. xxvi. 62—64. "And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? What *is it which* these witness against thee? But **JESUS** held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I **ADJURE** thee, by the **LIVING GOD**, that thou tell us whether thou be the **CHRIST**, the **SON OF GOD**. Jesus said unto him thou hast said." *

The names of **JESUS** and **CHRIST** taken singly are indicative of a Man, and that in opposition or contradistinction to God or Jehovah.

* If it be urged that though many of the preceding texts shew Jesus Christ to be a Man, (which is not the matter in dispute as they contend, and though the equivocation of making a Man and a Human Nature to be one while the same thing, and another while two things essentially different, prove it is,) yet they afford no proof that he is not also God; it is answered, that to prove the Manhood of Jesus Christ is all that is required to establish the point contended for. If he be a Man, he is possessed of an Individuality, He must then be a Human Person, and not a Human Nature, a something common to all mankind, but appropriated to none of the species. He must be what every Human Person is from his birth, and until his death: a complex being, consisting of a reasonable soul and human flesh, or Inward and Outward Man, and not a Human Nature, a something which is possessed of no Individuality. And in this case the Incarnation of Jehovah on the orthodox scheme falls to the ground. But to reply to the objection in its own terms. A Man can as soon be a Door, a Vine, a Worm, a Beast, constituting in their union a Monad or Numerical One, as a Man can be God, or God be Man, making a One in their union. No being from the highest to the lowest degree in the scale of Entity, can have such a union with another of a different rank or order as shall make it a Numerical One with it. It is a contradiction as well as an absurdity. The Spirit that is adapted to a state of union with a human body, and to all the acts and effects, appetites and passions derived from such a union, must be a human spirit. No other can be brought into a state of Numerical Oneness with it. To assert it is to join issue with the supporters of the doctrine of the Metempsychosis in all their extravagancies and absurdities.

1. According to the testimony of the Jews.

Luke xxiii. 35. "And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also with them derided *him*, saying, He saved others, let him save himself, if he be CHRIST the CHOSEN of GOD."

John iii. 2. "The same came to JESUS by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a TEACHER come FROM GOD: for NO MAN can do these miracles that THOU doest except GOD be with HIM."

John v. 18. "Therefore the Jews sought the more to KILL HIM, [*"Jesus" ver. 17.*] because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that GOD was HIS Father, making himself as [*ισοϋ* "*like,*" or invested with the power of] God."

The Revealed Version renders *ισοϋ* "*equal with.*" It is sufficient to observe that a delegated equality of condition, supposing equality of condition to be the right meaning of the word, is very different to an identity of Essence, (But see Ch. VIII. under Phil. ii. 5, 11.) for the force of *ισοϋ*.

2. According to the testimony of his Disciples.

Luke ii. 52. "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."

In the present state of things, difficulties both various and important, will ever be found to perplex the sincere inquirer into the truth as it is in Jesus. This text is an instance, whether it be considered by those who advocate the Incarnation of the Pre-existent Humanity, or by those who contend for the Incarnation of Jehovah. How will they who embrace the opinion that Jehovah took flesh, or, according to the language of some, was corporified, and in that incarnate state was One person, explain the words of the Evangelist, "Jesus increased in wisdom?" If their language has any definite meaning, the expression "Jehovah Incarnate, One Person in two Natures" called Jesus, so identifies Jehovah with the Humanity, that what belongs to the one, must be said of the other: and in that manner they give what they term a con-

ore to
should
at Hu-
quish a
cause a
hand on
to hold
doctrine
weighty
which make
the Lord
which now
t behoves us
light on the
ntemplation of
It will not be
some of the dis-
is state, and to
ch may reconcile
the difficulties

Man is a sub-
also be said of
e body which
of the Father,
aracter in the
laws of union
es any parti-
ward Man is
s of receiving
rd Man, it can
as or faculties of
bility to the acqui-
ion, however capable
ward Man must remain
otorious in every

sistent interpretation to Acts xx. 28. 1 John iii. 16. But could Jehovah "increase in wisdom"; or what is the same, could the fleshy tabernacle which Jehovah assumed, and which was himself, for they are made One Person, increase in wisdom? Could the Incarnation of Jehovah take away from Jehovah knowledge, &c., or suspend the consciousness of that knowledge, &c. during the years of Infancy? Yet these difficulties present themselves, and cannot be evaded on the ground taken by the advocates of Jehovah's Incarnation.

A difficulty of a somewhat similar nature is acknowledged by those who contend for the Incarnation of the Pre-existent Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Son, Prophet, and Servant of Jehovah. If Jehovah possessed him, The Beginning, before ever the earth was; if by him Jehovah formed all things; if he was King who governed the Universe for four thousand years, before he took flesh; how could he, it will be asked, by entering into a body prepared for him, lose all that vast treasure of knowledge which he once possessed, and be reduced to a condition in which he was to learn afresh what he must have known more perfectly than any of the creatures which he had made? It does not appear that all knowledge of the truths connected with salvation has been vouchsafed to mankind in any of the latter ages of the world. A large increase did certainly take place in the glorious days of the Reformation. Much was then vouchsafed, yet much remained to be learned of the manifold wisdom of God on those very points which were so unexpectedly revealed to the men of that benighted period. But notwithstanding the doctrines of Grace were then imperfectly stated and defended; their truth could not be destroyed. Though the arguments adduced in their support, fell far short of that perspicuity and precision manifested in later times, they were found more weighty than the difficulties which the adversary brought against them. They therefore maintained their ground in spite of all opposition, and administered consolation to every one who received them. Since that time light has much in-

creased, yet no one will assert that we have nothing more to learn. If therefore in the present instance a difficulty should arise, the advocate for the doctrine of the Pre-existent Humanity is not to be discouraged. He is not to relinquish a truth which the oracles of God plainly set forth, because a solution which will silence the gainsayer is not at hand on every point. But he is more especially encouraged to hold fast what he has received, when he perceives that the doctrine of his antagonists is embarrassed with not only more weighty objections, but is entangled with contradictions which make the Scriptures worse than a nullity. Waiting till the Lord by his Spirit shall be pleased to remove the cloud which now partially obscures a portion of his Revelation, it behoves us to turn to any quarter which may help to throw light on the subject. None can be more suitable than a contemplation of the character of man as found in the flesh. It will not be unprofitable to advert to his condition under some of the dispensations of God's providence to him in this state, and to examine whether there is not something which may reconcile us to the doctrine contended for, even with the difficulties attached to it.

It has been shewn that the Humanity or real Man is a subsistence independent of the body. This must also be said of the Humanity of the Saviour, in respect to the body which he took in the fulness of the time appointed of the Father, as well as of every one who bears the same character in the scale of creation. But what are the common laws of union between the body and the Humanity which takes any particular body? It is evident that though the Inward Man is possessed of very glorious and extensive powers of receiving knowledge, yet while it is united to the Outward Man, it can exert these powers no further than the organs or faculties of the Outward Man can assist. If any inability to the acquisition of ideas shall exist in its organization, however capable of the largest comprehension, the Inward Man must remain ignorant of what is around him. This is notorious in every

infant and idiot. But while the latter is incapable of any improvement, the former, as the senses are exercised by use, inoreases daily in wisdom. This however does not reach the case before us. The Soul or Inward Man is aptly compared, when it first comes into the world, to a blank on which nothing is written. Yet though it may acquire knowledge, none will contend that it had any previous ideas which could be lost, or be so obscured as to make a re-acquisition necessary. The experience of mankind however happily furnishes us with instances of both kinds, viz. of men of great attainments having had all ideas entirely blotted out, or so obscured by internal disease or outward injury, as to be reduced to a state of complete infancy, in which all former ideas were to be retraced, and all previous knowledge to be once more gradually acquired.*

* A modern author, from whom many of the above ideas are taken, writing on this subject, says, "There have been many instances wherein persons of eminence and skill in arts and sciences, have had the brain, with all the traces and images which were impressed upon it, so confounded that they have lost almost all their ideas and skill; they have even forgotten their native language, and knew not their own names: sometimes by slow degrees they have recovered their ideas and words again, and in some years have come to their former excellencies: the brain recovered its traces and images, and the soul recognized them with pleasure, in much less time than at first it acquired them." He adds, "Let us suppose the soul of the greatest philosopher or mathematician united to the body of a new-born infant: this soul would find no traces or images upon the brain of the babe correspondent with its former ideas; it would rather receive incessant impressions and sensations from this infant brain [according to the laws of union] derived from the sensible objects around it, or the natural inward motions and appetites which attend the infant state: thus all its learned ideas would be obliterated for a season. It is true that such a learned soul would much sooner recover its own ideas than one that never possessed them; and it could form images upon the brain, and attain the knowledge of them with greater speed and facility than other children could whose souls never had these learned ideas."—And then asks, "Why might not this be the case with the holy child Jesus? His glorious soul might submit to have its former sublime ideas at its first union to animal nature so concealed and overwhelmed by the overbearing impressions of infant animal nature, that

How far these instances or the application of them to Jesus, may have any force toward solving the difficulty which the words of Luke present, must be left to the reader to determine. There are other doctrines on which Christians in every age have acknowledged their inability to come to any satisfactory conclusion. Predestination, Free Will, the Origin of Sin, have caused divisions among those who have been agreed on the fundamentals of Christianity. Hence we should learn forbearance on the topic before us, which many pious men have pronounced in former times, and many still continue to pronounce, to have Scripture for its support.

To such as the above solution of the difficulty in question shall not be satisfactory, another view of the subject is proposed. It is said that "Jesus increased," &c. Before it can be determined what is said of Jesus, it must be known who Jesus is. And what saith Scripture that Jesus is? The seed of the woman. "Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a Son." "Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call his name Jesus." Is any thing more intended by the seed of the woman than that body which was concreated in the Virgin's womb, Job x. 10, '11, Ps. cxxxix. 14—16, and in due time was born into the world? The soul which dwells in the body of the Lord Jesus Christ, is nowhere mentioned as its co-existent partner when the future Incarnation is spoken of. Indeed the terms to be "made flesh," to be "made of a woman," preclude the idea

it might recover them again by such degrees as flesh and blood would admit; and so might grow in wisdom and knowledge and stature together."—He concludes with observing, "The history of our Lord in the gospels assures us that he attained the knowledge of things much sooner and with greater facility than common children: thus at the age of twelve he was discoursing with the doctors in the temple. When he began to preach, the Jews wondered how this man should know letters, having never learned. He knew his near relation to God, and his ancient glory, as many of his discourses testified.—He so far remembered his former glory as frequently to mention it, and sometimes pray for it."

of a soul being any part of that frame or constitution that was assumed by Him, whoever he was, that became incarnate: He was called the Word, the Son of God, and he is said to take flesh and tabernacle among us; but the union of a Soul with the body of flesh at the time of its assumption is not upon record in any part of Holy Writ. Can the male beget, or the female conceive a soul? The act of begetting or conceiving is wholly carnal. Like begets and conceives like. *Nec progenerant aquilæ columbam.* Could the seed of the woman, that which was conceived in her womb, that which was brought forth a Son, and was called Jesus, be any thing more than a body of flesh? But "Jesus increased in wisdom." The word rendered "increased" *προεκοπτε*, is to "make a progress or proficiency"; and *σοφια* translated "Wisdom" is the skill or dexterity which is derived from the use or exercise of the faculties, talents, senses, or perceptions, which that subject has which is said to make a proficiency. Though generally limited to the spiritual powers in man, it has equal relation to his material faculties. *Σοφια*, says Constantine, *scœpè accipitur pro arte*; *σοφοι*, *apud veteres dicebantur cujuslibet opificii artifices.* According to Parkhurst, *σοφια* is from *צפה* "to look around, watch." They who by reason of use have their bodily senses exercised, acquire skill or dexterity of those senses from that use. Whereas they who are without it, have neither skill nor dexterity. This is the case with the new-born infant, and in some few instances with others during the life of the body. To "increase in wisdom" does not therefore necessarily signify the exercise of the soul's faculties. It may refer to the material senses or powers. These become more acute, their skill in discerning the true character of the objects that are before them increases, and their proficiency is obvious to all around, in proportion to the degree of exercise to which they are habituated. The body which was prepared for Jesus, and which he assumed, may therefore with propriety be said to

"increase in wisdom," σοφία, skill or dexterity in the use of its faculties, senses, &c.* Jesus fulfilled all righteousness in performing the externals of the Jews' religion, and was in favour with God, as well as with men who could lay nothing to his charge, either in the violation of the spiritual precepts of the law, or in a neglect of the observance of its outward ordinances. With regard to the acts of the Inward or Pre-existent Man, it can hardly be said that he increased in favour with God, seeing that he had been "daily his delights before the mountains were settled"; and God had said of him, "Behold, my servant, whom I uphold, mine elect *in whom* my soul delighteth": any more than it could be said of him, who, "when he cometh into the world, saith, A body hast thou prepared me—Lo, I come to do thy will—Thy law is written in my

* In Gal. i. 13, 14, a similar expression occurs, and illustrates the subject under discussion, "Ye have heard of my conversation [*αναζωοφν*, behaviour, manner of life] in time past in the Jew's religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God and wasted it, [referring to his breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, and bringing them either men or women bound unto Jerusalem] and profited *προσκοπτον* in the Jews' religion above mine equals in mine own nation, being found exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers": such as "Touch not, taste not, handle not." Paul here distinguishes between "a Jew which is one outwardly" (*εν τω φανερω*, in overt acts) and "a Jew which is one inwardly" (*εν τω κρυπτω*, in the hidden man of the heart). The former is one who lives according to the manner and customs of the Jews' religion, conforming to the outward rites and ceremonies of the law of Moses. The latter is one who considers all the law as fulfilled in Christ Jesus, and lives by faith in him. Paul had been taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous towards God, as his countrymen were at that day. But he bare them record that their zeal was confined to externals, and that it was not according to knowledge. His proficiency had been like their's only in the letter of the law: and "bodily exercise," he declares, "profiteth little." Such was the Jews' religion in which he had made proficiency. It was "in the oldness of the letter, not in the newness of the spirit," It was such as the body could and did perform, viz. that which was "outward in the flesh," and in which "the inward man" had no part. Paul, though known of God, knew him not.

heart": and who himself said, "The Prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in me": And again, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" The parallel passage in 1 Sam. ii. 26. runs thus: "And the child Samuel grew on [הלך וגדל proceeded and increased] and was in favour וטוב both with Jehovah and also with man." The word גדל relates to an increase in externals only: and הלך placed before another verb preceded by ו, always signifies the continuance or increase of the action expressed by such verb. The circumstances alluded to by these words הלך וגדל in regard to Samuel was therefore merely external. It is likewise expressly said, "he was in favour וטוב [not that he increased or grew in favour] with Jehovah." Ought not Luke ii. 52, then be considered as containing in sense what follows; for whatever scheme be adopted, neither Jehovah incarnate nor his Pre-existent Son Jesus when he was made flesh, could increase in wisdom according to the usual acceptance of the word, viz. "Jesus increased in the due or right exercise of his corporeal faculties, &c. as he did in stature, and was in favour with God and man"? But independent of what has been already advanced in support of the opinion that the Pre-existent Humanity and not Jehovah was incarnate, and increased in wisdom as well as in stature, the latter part of the verse is decisive; viz. "And in favour with God and Man." The opposition and contradistinction to God is here so striking, that he who is called Jesus can be no other than a creature. For if Jesus was Jehovah incarnate, he could not increase in favour with Jehovah, since the body into which any Spirit enters to dwell, be it of whatever order it may, is but another Self. But Luke asserts that he did. Therefore the incarnate Jesus must be a distinct individual creature. And if when he came into the world to save sinners he then took a body prepared for him, he must have had a previous existence.

Whichever of the views given above may be thought most consistent with the Scriptures, this important lesson is to be

learned, that the greatest forbearance should be used toward them that differ in opinion with us on any subject, but more especially in what is considered a speculative point, or one which in our present state of knowledge is not free from difficulties. All need to have the way of God expounded unto them more perfectly: and it is evident that none, after the most diligent search, are now able to find out the Almighty or his Son Jesus to perfection. Another dispensation must take place before this blessing will be vouchsafed, in that fulness which man is capable of receiving. It is probable that even the Millennial age will be found defective in a complete comprehension of some of those things which the people of God now desire to look into; and that they will be reserved for that glorious period which shall succeed it.

John xi. 21, 22. "Then said Martha unto JESUS, Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. But I know, that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of GOD, GOD will give it THEE."

Acts iv. 26, 27. "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers were gathered together against THE LORD [Jehovah] and against his CHRIST. For of a truth against thy holy CHILD JESUS, whom THOU hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together."

1 Cor. i. 24. "CHRIST, the power of GOD, and the wisdom of GOD."

1 Cor. iii. 23. "Ye are Christ's, and CHRIST is GOD'S."

1 Cor. xi. 3. "The head of CHRIST is GOD."

Eph. i. 17. "That the GOD of our Lord JESUS CHRIST," &c.

Eph. i. 20. "Which HE wrought on CHRIST when he raised him from the DEAD, and set *him* at his own RIGHT HAND in the heavenly *places*."

Eph. iv. 32. "GOD for CHRIST's sake hath forgiven you."

Heb. v. 4, 5. "And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that was called of GOD as *was* Aaron. So also CHRIST glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but

HE that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee."

Heb. ix. 24. "For **CHRIST** is not entered into the holy places made with hands, *which are* the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the **PRESENCE** of **GOD** for us."

Rev. xii. 10. "And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our **GOD**, and the power of **HIS CHRIST**."

3. According to the testimony of Jesus Christ himself.

Luke ix. 20—22, 26. "He said unto them, But whom say ye that I am? Peter answering said, The **CHRIST** of **GOD**. And he straightly charged them and commanded them to tell no man that thing."

John xiii. 3. "**JESUS** knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was **COME FROM GOD**, and went [was going] to **GOD**."

John xiv. 1. "Ye believe in **GOD**, believe also in **ME**."

John xx. 17. "Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not: for I am not yet ascended [I ascend not yet] to **MY FATHER**: but go to **MY BRETHREN** and say unto them, I ascend unto **MY FATHER** and **YOUR FATHER**, and to **MY GOD**, and your God."

The names "**Jesus Christ**" taken in connection are indicative of a Man, and that in opposition or contradistinction to God or Jehovah."

1. According to the testimony of Jesus Christ's disciples.

Acts iii. 19—23. "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the **LORD**: and **HE** shall send **JESUS CHRIST**, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must **RECEIVE** until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A **PROPHET** shall the **LORD** your **GOD** raise up unto you of your **BRETHREN**, like unto **ME**, **HIM** shall ye

hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass *that* every soul, which will not hear that PROPHEET shall be destroyed from among the people."

Acts x. 36—38. "The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by JESUS CHRIST: (he is Lord of all:) that word, I say, ye know which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached. How GOD anointed JESUS of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for GOD was WITH him."

Rom. ii. 12, 16. "As many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law—in the day when GOD shall judge the secrets of men by JESUS CHRIST."

Will it be said that by Jesus Christ is intended a Human Nature, something short of that personal Individuality which constitutes the intire man? The Apostle Luke shall reply, "The times of this ignorance God winked at: but now commandeth all men every where to repent: because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by *that* man whom he hath ordained: whereof he hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts xvii. 30, 31.

Rom. iii. 24, 25. "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in CHRIST JESUS: Whom GOD hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in HIS BLOOD."

Phil. ii. 5, 6. "Let this mind be in you, which was also in CHRIST JESUS: who being in the form of GOD, thought it not robbery to be equal with GOD."

The usual manner of interpreting this text, which in the opinion of the orthodox of every denomination has some difficulty attending it, is to consider that the words, "Christ Jesus"—"In the form of God"—and "God," do severally mean "God Himself." But will this passage bear the test of such a sense being applied to each of these words? viz.

“Let this mind be in you, which was also in God himself; who being God himself, thought it not robbery to be equal to God himself.” See Chap. VIII. where this text again occurs.

1 Tim. ii. 5. “For there is one God, and one Mediator between GOD and Men, THE MAN CHRIST JESUS.”

Can it be denied that the words “God and Men” are in contradistinction to one another? If so, can the succeeding terms “the Man Christ Jesus” be in apposition to God?

1 Pet. ii. 4, 5. “To whom coming as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but CHOSEN of GOD and precious, ye also as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to GOD by JESUS CHRIST.”

1 John ii. 1. “My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an ADVOCATE with the FATHER, JESUS CHRIST the righteous.”

What conclusion can be drawn from the testimony of these three disciples of the Lord, but that Jesus Christ is a Man; and as a man must have an Individual character distinct and separate from God his Father? Can opposition or contradistinction to God be more clearly marked, than by Jesus Christ's being said to be “sent of God,” “anointed” of God, made a “Mediator between God and men,” and “an Advocate with God”?

2. According to the testimony of Jesus Christ himself.

John xvii. 1, 3. “These words spake Jesus—This is life eternal, that they might know THEE, the only true GOD and JESUS CHRIST, whom thou hast SENT.”

It may be objected, that though a great proportion of the texts above quoted, will prove that Jesus Christ was a Man, it is questionable whether any of them will prove that he was only a Man. However ingenuity may torture words, or prejudice may resolve not to understand their meaning, a Man can be only a Man. How are we to ascertain the existence of Man, or of any Being that presents itself to our view?

By the outward frame alone can it be known what the Being is that stands before us. The body is all that we can see, or that our other senses can act upon. In every other case it is allowed to denote what is contained in it. No other inhabitant is ever supposed, but what can use the parts or faculties of that body as its appropriate instruments. The animal form of Man may display in its actions the ferocity of the Tiger or the filthiness of the Swine, yet none but the Metempsychosian, if he could be induced to invert the order of his own Creed, would infer from thence, that the Creature he contemplated was not only a Man, but that he was also a Tiger or a Hog incarnate.

Arguing from the data which the Bible furnishes, and the Bible refers us to the objects which are around us as the appointed means of information on every spiritual topic, it may be safely asserted, that if we would "clearly see the invisible things of God," we must search for the right means in "the things that are made," because, according to the appointment of his unerring wisdom, they are to be understood in that way alone. Rom. i. 20. To be able to comprehend any Bible Revelation we must therefore have recourse to the different objects with which we are surrounded for some counterpart, which reflects as in a mirror the subject matter we are to learn. "For now we see as by means of a mirror, δι' εσόπτρου, after the manner of an Enigma, εν αινιγματι." 1 Cor. xiii. 12. But where in the objects around us do we find things inanimate, such as a Door, or a Vine, or things animate, such as a Worm, or a Beast, dwelling in and forming an Individual character or Numerical Oneness with a Man? We have nowhere an example, and therefore no one has ever ventured on such a solution of the language of Holy Writ in John x. 7—xv. 5. Ps. xxii. 6—lxxiii. 22. as to pronounce the Man Jesus Christ to be a Door, a Vine, a Worm, a Beast Incarnate. On what foundation then does the union of such incongruities as Finite and Infinite, making an Individual Character or Numerical Oneness of the Two, depend? Where do we meet with

any such instance in the heights above, or in the depths below? The words "Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith Jehovah," beside that they would prove too much, will not be brought as the argumentum ad clenchem, as one of their "strong reasons" or most convincing proofs. Nor would the Individual union of the Man Jesus Christ with Jehovah of hosts, as forming a Numerical One, have been considered less revolting to Bible precept and daily experience, if the prejudices of education had not had a greater influence than the determinations of Common Sense. It is inconsistent with all just notions of the things of which we have experience, that a spirit superior to a human soul should be made subject to the infirmities, as well as that an inferior spirit should be partaker of the excellencies of human flesh. A Man therefore must be, and can be, only a Man.*

* But it is more usual in speaking upon this subject to say, that the Lord Jesus Christ was not a mere Man. Can a man, a human being or creature, be other than a Mere Man, human being or creature? To be more or less than a Man would at once prove such a Being not to be a Man. The word *Mere* means, that a Thing or Being is this or that only, and nothing else more or less: that it is *divided* or *separated* from others. Merus, *mere*, from *μειν* to divide. To say that the Lord Jesus Christ is a Man, and yet that he is not a Mere Man, that is without a union with some other Being with whom he forms a perfect One, or of whom he is a constituent part, is to say, that He is necessarily divided or separated from all others, or he would not rank with that class of Beings to which he belongs, and at the same time to affirm that he is so united with another, as to make with that other a Monad of a different description. A Man must be a Mere Man, that is, nothing but a Man, to be a Man. To be more or less than Man, or to be united to a Being of another classification, so as to form in union with him a perfect One, puts an end to his Humanity.

But, moreover, this Numerical Oneness of Jehovah with the Man Jesus Christ, is determined by the advocates of the doctrine to be absolutely necessary on the ground of the Atonement. How, it is asked, can the justice of an Infinite God be appeased but by a sacrifice of Infinite worth? A two-fold answer may be given to this inquiry. First, An infinite atonement cannot be necessary to satisfy for sins finite in number as well as in heinousness. And this must ever be the character of the sins of any Individual of mankind however extended in number or atrocity. It would therefore be unjust to require and superfluous to

give such a recompense. And if Justice could require it, in what manner, on the plan proposed to atone for sins, could the satisfaction be proved from the sacrifice offered up? Could Deity suffer, bleed, die? If not where would be the Infinite Atonement? It would be only begging the question to say, that the *κοινωνία ιδιωμάτων*, i. e. "the communication of properties," will suffice: as well as administering superfluous comfort to assert that a penalty had been paid of greater price than any debt which had been or could be contracted. But Secondly, if the typical sacrifice is to be our guide in forming a just estimate of the real character of the antitypical, and if not for what reason was it given, what satisfaction can be looked for upon the ground of the indwelling Deity? Neither the Ox, Sheep, nor Goat, which appeased Divine wrath and averted temporal judgments, had any indwelling Spirit which effected or contributed toward the propitiatory mercy conferred or received. The blood that was shed, accompanied with the corporeal anguish that was endured, atoned for the multiplied sins of the delinquent. If these types therefore represent the way of spiritual mercies, and it cannot be denied that such was their design, the presence of Deity is set aside as a necessary co-partner in the work of Infinite Redemption. And indeed if Scripture be considered, where shall we find even any reference to the Soul or Inward Man of the Saviour in those high offices or actions by which Salvation is effected on Earth. Let the preceding pages of this work, and more particularly pp. 181—183, be consulted for confirmation of the sentiment, that when the Messiah came in a body prepared, fitted, or adapted to his creature character, his design was to do in that body the will of Him who sent him, viz. to put an end to those sacrifices and burnt offerings which were a shadow of him that was to come, and by the offering of his body once, to make an end of sins (sin offerings), make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in an everlasting righteousness.

CHAPTER VIII.

WHEN a decision is demanded on any point in which the present welfare of our fellow creatures is concerned, both reason and duty require that the parties who are to give judgment, should not only divest themselves of every prejudice which they may have entertained on the subject in question, but should also banish as far as possible from their recollection every circumstance connected with it, that the evidence which is given may alone operate upon their minds, and direct their determination. A similar requisition is now made on a topic in which it must be acknowledged, that the mutual peace and harmony of those who are willing to be thought and appear Christians is involved. They are requested to blot out as far as possible from their remembrance, all that their early years, or their more matured judgment had embraced as undoubted truths on the subject of a Pre-existent Human Saviour, and to weigh the Scriptures that are about to be adduced in the balance of the Sanctuary: considering the force of their literal expression, and noting whether their mutual agreement, as well as their interpretation of each other, is such as intitles them to the character which it is contended they bear.

Various terms in the Old and New Testament, with the passages in which they occur, have been presented to the reader, to shew how far mankind have been led away from a most important fundamental truth by a strange perversion of the meaning of those terms; and to point out that mortifying but unquestionable fact, that the learned and the godly have

for many ages consented to receive, without due examination, the opinions which were established on such perversions.

It is now intended to consider some texts which speak immediately of the **Pre-existence** of the "One Mediator between God and men, the Man Jesus Christ." These from a misapplication to a wrong object, have, in conjunction with the perversions already noticed, been made to obscure the glorious light of Revelation on this important point, and to advance the cause of infidelity more than the sophisticated arguments of every description of heretics since the Incarnation. As far as misguided man is concerned, every effort has been employed, in some instances it is to be apprehended intentionally, and in others unconsciously, to destroy the temple of God. Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure. The powers of hell shall not prevail against it. The great adversary, the leader of this confederacy against Jehovah and his Son Jesus, waxes bolder from the success which has attended his measures; while his wrath increases, "because he knoweth that," however he now prospers, "he hath but a short time." The measure of the iniquities of himself and his associates is now filled up, and the hour is at hand when they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory, to gather his Elect from one end of heaven to the other. That glorious day is ready to dawn, when they shall no longer hurt nor destroy in all God's holy mountain, but the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah as the waters cover the sea.

The following texts are selected as specimens, from the many which the Old and New Testament furnish on this subject.

Gen. xxxii. 24. "And Jacob was left alone: and there wrestled a man with him, until the breaking of the day."

The prophet Hosea, speaking of this occurrence, calls the person that wrestled with Jacob an Angel מלאך; Moses a Man איש. But neither מלאך nor איש are applied to Jehovah. They therefore can have reference only to a creature. And

such was the opinion of the Jews near the time of the Incarnation.

The Targum of Jonathan says, It was the Angel in the likeness of a man, named Michael, that wrestled with Jacob. Neither the term Angel, מלאך, "messenger," nor the name Michael, מיכאל, "who like the Mediator," if this authority can be allowed to have any weight, leads to any other conclusion than that the Angel was a created being. In still later times, when the knowledge of the Pre-existent Human Saviour was either wholly lost or rejected, this Angel was considered to have been only ideal. Josephus calls it "a Phantom, with which Jacob seemed to contend and wrestle:" and Maimonides represents this transaction as done in the "vision of prophecy." But what saith Scripture? It declares the wrestling to have been real and corporeal on the part of both. "There wrestled a Man אִישׁ with him." And what does Scripture say of this Man? Jacob having prevailed "called the place Peniel," פְּנֵי אֵל, "the face or presence of the Mediator." Nor is this opposed by the succeeding words: "For I have seen Aleim face to face, and my life is preserved." However strange it may sound in the ear of believers of later ages, in earlier times it was held that Jehovah never spake nor acted of himself, but always by his Word, his Son. He was the Mediator. Compare 1 Kings xviii. 31, with Gen. xxxii. 28. He was also Aleim to the people of the Most High. There is a two-fold mistake on this subject. First, neither אֵל nor אֱלֹהִים are names which have any respect to Essence. They are not Proper but Attributive names, expressive of character, relation or dignity, and belong as well to the creature as to Jehovah. Secondly, אֱלֹהִים, when employed in its highest sense, is used in conjunction with the creature. "And Jehovah said unto Moses, See, I have made thee Aleim to Pharaoh," i. e. "I have made thee *as* Aleim in the place or stead of Aleim to Pharaoh." So "Jacob called the name of that place Peniel," פְּנֵי אֵל, "the face or presence of the Mediator, for [he said] I have

seen him who is *as* Aleim face to face, and my life is preserved." The title of Aleim can be applied with as much propriety to Christ the Mediator, as to Moses the Mediator. And that such was the design is further apparent from the words of Jehovah to Moses, where the supplementary particle is found. "And he [Aaron] shall be, *even* he shall be to thee instead of a mouth לְפִי, and thou shalt be to him instead of Aleim, לְאֵלִים."*

* "Moses, Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, saw the Aleim of Israel. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand: also they saw The Aleim אֱלֹהִים, and did eat and drink." This could not be Jehovah. The Scriptures declare no man hath seen him at any time, nor can see him. It must have been a creature. None will deny that there are some things hard to be understood in every part of the sacred Volume. And though the particular Scriptures which contain these hard sayings are not to be expounded from human authorities, yet until Christians are better agreed on these several points, there will be no impropriety in referring to what the Jews have said on the subject. Onkelos, on this place, has the following words יֵת יִקְרָא דֵּי וְגו' "And they saw the Glory of Jehovah," &c. Jonathan, יֵת אִיקֵר שְׂכִינָתָא דֵּי וְגו' "And they saw the Glory of the Habitation of Jehovah," &c. Now what say the Targumists and Midrashists of the Glory and Shechinah of Jehovah? The Targumists commonly describe the same person under the titles of מִימְרָא and שְׂכִינָה. And though there is some obscurity, and even discordance, in their expressions on these points, yet the most famous writers of the synagogue consider them both as intended to set forth the same exalted person. The Midrashists, or allegorical commentators, refer almost all the appearances of Jehovah mentioned in Scriptures to the מִימְרָא and שְׂכִינָה in the same way as the Targumists. They speak of Jehovah as absconding in his first Sephira, and transacting every thing by his Wisdom and Understanding, terms synonymous with מִימְרָא and שְׂכִינָה. They say that Wisdom is called the Beginning, that שְׂכִינָה, or Wisdom, rules the world: that it was שְׂכִינָה which appeared to Adam after he had sinned, and made him coats, &c.—that appeared to Abram—to Jacob by night at Luz, and upon the ladder—to Moses—to Israel on Mount Sinai—and which spake to Moses when the law was given. They call the שְׂכִינָה the Adam of above, after whose image Adam was formed—The Bridegroom of the synagogue, to whom alone the care and conduct of Israel was intrusted—who smote the Egyptians—to whom the Temple was built—who was the Redeemer and Shepherd of Jacob—the Angel of the Presence and of the Covenant. These allegorical commentators also have their oppositions and contradictions, being not more consistent

Josh. v. 13, 14. "And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand; and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, *art* thou for us, or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay; but as Captain of the host of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth."

Two of the later interpreters of Holy Writ among the Jews, Ben Gersom and Abarbinel, suppose that this Scripture relates to a transaction which was in a "vision of prophecy:" but like the preceding passage in Genesis, it speaks of a real person that appeared to Joshua, and of real words and actions that occurred between them. "Joshua lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a Man *עמד* over against him—and Joshua went with him, and Joshua fell on his face to the earth." This Man was the Angel promised in Exodus xxiii. 23, compared with Joshua xxiv. 11, whom Jarchi says was "Michael," and the ancient Jews, "the Angel, the Redeemer." He, who in Joshua's day was the "Captain [*שר* "the director, commander, chief,"] of Jehovah's host" (and as such was an Individual distinct and separate from Jehovah) afterward came and dwelt among his Brethren, being made like unto them in all things when he took part of flesh and blood. He was the power of God,

with respect to the Sephiroth, than the Targumists with regard to the *מיטרא*. Nor will this be a matter of surprise to Christians, as Truth alone can be consistent. The difficulty is to discover where truth lies. The Jewish writers will not lead us through this labyrinth: and the use here made of their opinions is only to shew that the term Aleim was not always considered by them as necessarily implying the Essence of Jehovah. The true signification of Aleim is however not to be deduced either from them, or from the generality of Christians, who judaize in all that belongs to the names or terms by which Jehovah hath set forth his great work of redemption. Notwithstanding Aleim is by both rendered, "Judge, Judges, Angels," &c. yet the most consistent modern authors, and the writer agrees with them, contend that it has no other signification than either Jehovah in his Covenant work, or That his glorious Creature, *שמים*, the "Heavens," which they who know not Jehovah set up in his place.

and the Captain of their salvation. In his hands were all Jehovah's hosts. At his voice the winds were hushed, and the sea was made calm. Life and death were with him. He spake and it was done. He who was in Joshua's day the "Captain of Jehovah's hosts," with his sword drawn on behalf of the Israel of God, is still on their side: he will never leave them nor forsake them. Like Jericho's walls, the strong holds of the adversary shall fall before him, and by means equally incompetent in the opinion of man to effect that desired event. The priests of the Lord, bearing the ark of the Covenant, when they shall proclaim his Pre-existent power and present grace, shall see the salvation of God manifested to a sinful but believing world. No sword shall be unsheathed but the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. This shall accomplish the purpose for which it is sent. The Israel of God shall by this mean tread under foot the world, the flesh, and the devil. The heathen, the kings of the earth, and the rulers, shall rage in vain, and in vain set themselves against Jehovah, and against his Messiah, who marshalled the host of heaven from the beginning, and to whom in the flesh all power is given in heaven and in earth.

Judges xiii. 3, 6. "And the Angel of the Lord appeared unto the woman, and said unto her.—Then the woman came and told her husband, saying, A man of God came unto me, and his countenance *was* like the countenance of an angel of God."

It is plain from the text, that the person who appeared to the woman was not Jehovah: "the Angel [מַלְאָךְ messenger] of Jehovah appeared unto the woman." It is equally certain that he who talked with her was a man: "Then the woman came and told her husband שׂרָא, saying, The man שׂרָא of The Aleim came unto me." And that he was the Pre-existent Mediator, לֵא, who had wrestled with Jacob, and was to be manifested in the flesh, is evident from a subsequent part of the history, compared with Is. ix. 6. "The angel of Jehovah said unto him, Why askest thou thus after my name,

Truly It is Wonderful," (or "Very Wonderful," the ' in **פלא** being paragogic) **והוא פלא**. "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, **פלא**, Counsellor, the mighty Mediator, **אל גבור**." Upon the disappearance of the Angel, the messenger, the man, "Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen the Aleim." It will not be easy to solve this difficulty, if the apparent letter of the text only is strictly adhered to. Can he that is sent **מלאך**, be the same in Essence with him that sent him? For sending implies not only a distinction, but a separate existence in Essence. But neither Manoah nor his wife, nor any other man could have seen Jehovah. Therefore some ellipsis must be understood here. We shall surely die, because we have seen the Aleim in the person of the messenger, the Man. "We have seen *him who is as or in the stead of Aleim*." "He that hath seen me," the man Jesus in the flesh, the Child born, the Son of the Virgin, "hath seen the Father:" i. e. He hath seen Me, who am as or instead of the Father.

Job xix. 25. "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth."

It is uncertain who was the penman of the book of Job, or at what time Job lived. Both these points are however immaterial. The words of Ezekiel, chap. xiv. 14, and of the Apostle James, chap. v. 11, prove the existence of such a person; and the silence which was observed in the long controversy between him and his friends with respect to any writings divinely inspired, as well as the frequent appeals made to men famed for years and wisdom, and to traditions of former times, stamp an antiquity upon the sentiments contained in this book to which no other can pretend. Job, who was probably co-æval with, if he did not live before, Moses, says, that he knew that his Redeemer lived or was then living: not that he would come into being, but did exist at the time when he uttered those words. But let the

man of Uz speak for himself. אֲנִי יִדְעָתִי “I have a clear mental perception of נֶאֱלִי my near kinsman הַיִּ the living One; וְאַחֲרָיו, and he the latter one [or second Adam] יָקִים shall stand up in judgment עַל עַפְרָה over [them that have been, are, or shall be] dust.” As if he had said, “It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment,”—“for we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ.”—“Because God hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by *that* Man whom he hath ordained.” The words immediately before this confession of a then existing Redeemer, who would be the judge of the quick and the dead, are as striking as important. Job had complained of a general desertion of his servants, friends and family: yet to shew that in this forlorn state all hope and consolation were not gone, but that there remained something better than them all, even that נֶאֱלִי “near kinsman *or* Redeemer,” who has been the hope of the believer from the beginning, and will be his solace to the end of the world; he says, “O, that my words were written; O, that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever!” viz. וְאֲנִי וְנִי “For I know,” &c. As if he had said, Though all forsake and unite in persecuting me, yet as my Kinsman, and, as such, my Redeemer, who now liveth and shall live for evermore, will never fail me nor forsake me, but will ever be on my side. I may boldly say, The Lord is my helper, I will not fear what man can do unto me.

Ps. ii. 2. “The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against Jehovah, and against his Anointed.”

Christian divines, as well as the greater part of the Jewish writers, have agreed that this Psalm speaks of the Lord's Christ. But there is a point disputed in these latter times by both Jews and Christians; viz. whether he had an Existence when the Psalmist made this record of him. Subsequent verses are sufficient to remove every doubt. “He that sitteth

in the heavens shall laugh: he that is Ruler, מֶלֶךְ, shall have them in derision. Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure, saying, Of a truth I am anointed The King [the ם in מֶלֶךְ is paragogic, and the verb נִסְכַּרְתִּי being preceded by the nominative pronoun אֲנִי has a present signification] over my holy hill Zion. I will declare the decree, Jehovah hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." Whether the subject of this Psalm be considered as relating to the first or second advent of Messiah, he is plainly spoken of as having an existence at the time when this prophecy of his future triumphs was delivered. "He [Messiah] that sitteth [יָשָׁב therefore was then sitting] in the heavens." [making that his throne (See p. 80.) which afterwards was to be the means of supporting the body which he should assume, according to that Scripture, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the Aleim." i.e. the heavens, the Aleim of the heathen.] "Of a truth I am anointed The King." In both these passages the speaker is still the same. נִסְכַּרְתִּי cannot be "I have anointed," but "I am anointed." It was owing to our translators not seeing the Pre-existent Messiah that they have in this and other Scriptures disregarded the tense of the verb, and attributed to Jehovah, what is immediately spoken by and of the creature his Son, The Christ. In some instances also, as in the present, they have rejected the help which the LXX. afforded them toward a right understanding of the Old Testament Scripture. This passage in the LXX. version is, "But I am set up king under him upon Zion his holy hill, declaring the decree of the Lord: the Lord hath said unto me," &c. All power was therefore at that time in the hands of Messiah, as much as at this moment Jehovah reigneth throughout all ages, but his government is carried on at all times and in all places, which the Bible speaks of, by his Son Messiah. "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." "Jesus knowing that the Father had

given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God." &c.

Ps. xl. 6—8. "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God."

It is evident from the Epistle to the Hebrews where this prophecy is cited and explained, that it relates to the Incarnation of Messiah. "When he cometh into the world he saith, Sacrifice and burnt offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me. In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come [in the volume of the book it is written of me] to do thy will, O God."

There are three peculiar circumstances which mark the character of the speaker. He addresses himself to God. He announces his coming into this world to do God's will in a body prepared (*Margin*, fitted) for him. And he declares that this was to fulfil what had been written concerning him. What are the inferences to be drawn from these premises? The first is, that independent of his name, Christ, which makes it self evident that he must be a creature, as Deity cannot be said to be anointed, the speaker could not be Jehovah. But Jehovah as Son, could not address Jehovah as Father, saying, Lo, I come, to do thy will; because the will of the one could not be contrary to the will of the other. They must at all times be the same, or this Scripture will not be true: "I Jehovah change not." But Messiah in another place says, "Not what I will, but what thou wilt," proving that he was another both in Individuality and Essence than Jehovah. The second inference is, that "Coming into the world," *εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, he must have been in existence before that period: and coming in a body prepared, fitted, or adapted to the creature-character that he possessed, his design was to do in that body the will of him who sent

him : viz. to put an end to those sacrifices and burnt offerings which were a shadow of him that was to come; and by the offering of his body once, to make an end of sins, (sin-offerings) make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in an everlasting righteousness. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life—I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." The third inference is, that, appearing in the flesh at that time, he fulfilled all the Scriptures which had spoken of this love and mercy. The first dispensation of typical sacrifice, offerings, burnt offerings and sin offerings was taken away, and the second of the will of God in the sacrifice of his Incarnate Pre-existent Son, Messiah, was established.

But the expressions "Lo, I come"—"I delight to do thy will," are deserving of particular attention, as denoting not merely a readiness but the absence of any necessity or compulsion. To suppose that the Man Jesus Christ did not exist before the Incarnation, is to assert that he was brought into the world without any consciousness, at least at his birth, to take upon him the arduous work of redeeming sinners, and only then concurred with the divine will when he attained the age in which he could and did learn the purpose for which he was born. To suppose that the Lord's Christ did not exist before the Incarnation, is to assert that the work of redemption was a task imposed upon him without his knowledge, and before his assent could be given. It stands in direct opposition to the Scripture which assert an original and voluntary engagement on his part as a Man in contradistinction to Deity. "Lo, I come" to tabernacle in the body fitted for me, (adapted to that peculiar rank and station which I hold in the scale of Creation) that I may begin and finish the work which thou gavest me to do : viz. to do and suffer thy will, O my God, though it be so contrary to my own will. Whereas instead of an unavoidable necessity or compulsion, it is the obvious design of all the typical sacrifices and offerings to

express that endearing and perfect acquiescence in the will and command of the Father, which is set forth in the words of the Saviour when he came into the world: "Then said I, lo! I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God."

Prov. viii. 22—30. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was. When there were no depths, I was brought forth, when there were no fountains abounding with water. Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth; while as yet he had not made the earth, nor the fields, nor the highest part of the dust of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was there: when he set a compass upon the face of the depth: when he established the clouds above: when he strengthened the fountains of the deep: when he gave to the sea his decree, that the water should not pass his commandment: when he appointed the foundations of the earth: then I was by him, as one brought up with him: and I was daily his delights, rejoicing always before him."

The whole of this chapter, but more especially this part of it, is generally quoted as a direct proof of the Deity of him who is called Christ. But the language even of the English Version, if attentively considered, affords no just ground for such a decision: much less does the original, as it has been already shewn in some observations made on the two first verses of this passage (See p. 52) "Jehovah possessed me, The Beginning, his Way, the First of his works. From that particular point of time, from hidden time past was I anointed, from the beginning of time, from the times which were before the earth."

In these verses a Being is presented us with two leading characteristic peculiarities. First, a distinct, and as far as Essence is involved, a separate existence from Jehovah: secondly, a derivation from Jehovah, and consequently a dependance upon him. These are no proofs of Deity. The

succeeding verses contain additional features of his creature-character. "I was by him [נצלו *near, hard by, with him—*נצל *to place by or near oneself.*] as one brought up *with him.* [נמן, *a nurse child—*נמן *to tend, take care of.*] I was daily his delights, rejoicing always before him." Can these words lead to any other conclusion than that the Being of whom they speak is distinct from Jehovah. Jehovah possessed the creature-essence of him whom he anointed or set up as the foundation and head of all his works in this system. And it cannot be too often urged upon the attention of the Bible student, that the Holy Scriptures speak of no other. He was produced or brought forth into being from a state of non-entity before the hills or mountains had an existence. "Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth." These expressions fall far short of what is usually attributed to the term "Eternity," and to the "Eternal Generation" of him who is affirmed to be "Jehovah Son." They describe, which is all that words can do, the date of his existence of whom they speak to be before the several parts of the terraqueous globe, or those of the mundane system were arranged, if not before they were produced into being. And as there was no prior date with respect to "the things that are made," by which the beginning of his existence could be marked, they are applied to him for this purpose, and they set him forth as "the beginning of the creation of God," "the first-born of every creature," without furnishing the least hint that he was of the essence, or partook of the duration *à parte antè* of Jehovah his Father.

Isa. xi. 1, 10. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots—And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people: to it shall the Gentiles seek."

This chapter is acknowledged by Jews, both ancient and modern, to be a prophecy of Messiah, and to the prejudices which education has instilled is now to be attributed the rejec-

tion, by both Jew and Gentile, of the doctrine which it contains concerning him. The Incarnation of Messiah is clearly expressed in the first verse. "And there shall come forth a rod [חֹטֶר a twig] out of the stem [גֹּזַע a stump or stock that has been cut down] of Jesse, and a branch [נֶעֱרַר a sucker, springing from the tree when cut down] shall grow out of his roots." Q. D. When the family of Jesse, in the line of David, shall be like a tree cut down, and its stump or stock only left in the ground, there shall arise out of it Messiah, that great king, before spoken of in many pre-eminent titles, viz. "Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty Mediator, the Father of the age past and to come, the Prince of peace," who shall be higher than the kings of the earth, and of whom when he shall appear it will be said, "a greater than Solomon is here." In agreement with which the Targum of Jonathan has rendered it: "And the king shall come forth from the children of Jesse, even Messiah from the children of his children shall grow up." וַיִּפּוֹק מֶלֶכָּא מִבְּנוֹתֵי דִישׁ מְשִׁיחָא מִבְּנֵי בְּנוֹתֵי יִתְרֵבִי. His individual or personal character as a Man is thus especially marked, as it is also distinguished and separated in the succeeding verses from Jehovah, by the manner in which he was to be qualified for his work of Mediation: "And the Spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him," &c.

Nor is the Pre-existence of Messiah, whose Incarnation is so clearly announced in the first verse, less plainly declared in the tenth, "And in that day the [not "a"] root of Jesse, shall be, who standeth up [עָמַד, with the nominative אִשָּׁר immediately preceding, is in the present time] for an ensign of the people. To him shall the Gentiles seek." It is beyond a doubt that Messiah, as "of the seed of David according to the flesh," could not be the root, or a root of Jesse. The effect must ever be after the cause. Christ, the son in the flesh, could not be before Jesse his father. To remove this difficulty recourse has been had to the doctrine of the Incarnation of Jehovah. Deity is made that root, notwithstanding

the objection which must obtrude itself upon the most superficial observer: viz. that like produces like. As the root so must be the rod, twig, branch, or sucker. If the former be Deity, the latter cannot be Humanity. Paul expressly states to the Church at Antioch that this prophecy relates to the Man Christ Jesus. "I have found David the *son* of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, who shall fulfil all my will. Of this man's seed hath God according to *his* promise raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus." And to the Church at Rome he speaks in terms equally unequivocal of his pre-existent state. "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises *made* unto the fathers: and that the Gentiles might glorify God for *his* mercy: as it is written—The root of Jesse shall be *εσαι ἡ ρίζα του Ιεσσαί*, even he who standeth up *καὶ ὁ ἀνισταμενος* to reign over the Gentiles. In him shall the Gentiles trust." John adopts the same language, "Weep not: behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, hath prevailed, &c." And our Lord himself says, "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the Root of David." Whatever the Root was in its Essence, that must David be. Jesus as David's root was in Old Testament language *וְנ*, a positive Creature-Entity, of marvellous power; in the New Testament language *ὁ εσω ανθρωπος*, the *Inner Man*. Jesus and David must therefore be alike in Essence: for the Root cannot in that respect differ from the branch, any more than the head from the body and members. The Pharisees in Christ's day were ignorant of this truth, as Christians in general appear to be in the present day. When they were asked by Jesus, "What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They said unto him, The Son of David." This was indeed the truth, but only a part of the truth. "God had sworn with an oath to David that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." But he who was to be of the seed of David according to the flesh, had a Pre-ex-

istent state, and was well known to David, and had been the subject of the greatest exaltation by David and the Church before him in all ages. To try the Pharisees on this point, and to shew them their ignorance on this head, Jesus said unto them, if Christ be no more than the Son of David after the flesh, "How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord, saying, Jehovah said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thine enemies thy footstool. If David then call him Lord," attributing to him a state of exalted existence at that moment, "how is" it that when he shall be manifested, "he is" "his Son." "And no man was able to answer him a word," because they knew not that truth which Jesus has recorded by his servant John, "I am the root and the offspring of David": viz. that he who was in the Outward Man the offspring of David, the fruit of his loins, was in the Inward Man the root of David; the Tree of Life whose seed is in himself after his kind; the Pre-existent Lord and Redeemer, who was in the beginning with Jehovah, and in the fulness of the time was being flesh of a woman, that hanging on the Cross he might stand up for an ensign,* to which both Jew and Gentile should come for life and salvation.

* The Apostate Jews object to this application of **דג**, translated "ensign," or "banner," as a proof that Messiah was to come of the family of David, and that being in his flesh the propitiatory sacrifice for the sin of the world, there should be given to him dominion and glory and a kingdom, and that all people, nations and languages should serve him. The following parallel passages are however a sufficient ground of hope and confidence to the Christian. "In that day shall be the root of Jesse, who standeth up" in the flesh "for an ensign **דג** of the people. To him" in that state "shall the Gentiles seek." "Jehovah said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it for an ensign **דג**: and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it, shall live." "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." It is by being thus lifted up from the earth, that Messiah draws unto him Jew and Gentile. They become a willing people in this day of his power. They hail him as their Lord and King. They seek his kingdom and righteousness, and trust in him at all times.

Mic. v. 2—4. "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, *though* thou be little among the thousands of Judah, *yet* out of thee shall he come forth unto me *that* is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth *have been* from of old, from everlasting. Therefore will he give them up, until the time *that* she which travaileth hath brought forth: then the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel. And he shall stand and feed (*Margin, rule*) in the strength of Jehovah, in the majesty of Jehovah his Aleim."

A part of the words here quoted have been already considered for the purpose of shewing the right meaning of עולם and קדם. See Ch. III. to the former of which the sense of a never ceasing duration, and to the latter of a past duration without beginning, has been erroneously given by almost every expositor of Holy Writ. The object in correcting these errors was to remove some of the obstacles which have been so long opposed to the reception of that fundamental truth, the Pre-existence of the Man Jesus Christ.

It now remains to observe that Bethlehem Ephratah, though little among the thousands of Judah, was according to this prophet to be honoured in becoming the birth-place in the flesh of the ruler of Israel, whose peculiar character was, that his "goings forth" *had been* from the First time מקדם from the days of hidden time past מימי עולם." Beside that קדם speaks directly of that primæval day which formed the beginning of the series of ages which have been evolved since Jehovah went forth to action in respect to the mundane system, in giving being to his Son Jesus, and bringing into existence the atoms of which that system consists; the term מוצאת which relates to his First-born, rendered "goings forth," means the manifestation or actual appearance of a person at the time spoken of. יצא is to "come or go forth into action," and of course implies positive existence. And this ruler in Israel, whose goings forth were co-æval with the First-time, is afterwards described as one of many brethren, the remnant of whom shall return when the appointed time of restoring

the kingdom of Israel and of Judah shall arrive. A Pre-existence and a Creature-pre-existence is therefore evident, since the words, taken in their plain and literal sense, can only speak of the going forth of that glorious Being to action from the Beginning of the world, and of his manifestation in the flesh as the seed of David when the fulness of the time was come. His marked character of distinction from Jehovah makes it impossible to confound him with Jehovah. For when he shall have brought back "the remnant of his brethren," it is said, "he shall stand and feed (*Margin*, rule) in the strength of Jehovah, in the majesty of the name of Jehovah his Aleim."

Zech. ix. 9. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion: shout O daughter of Jerusalem: Behold thy king cometh unto thee: he is lowly and riding upon an ass."

An error in the translation of the two words יָנִי "lowly, and," has led the way to a misapplication of this prophecy in one of its principal points. יָנִי is rendered *pauper* by Calvin, Junius, and Tremellius, and *inops* by Cocceius,* and is understood in the same sense by the Rabbins, as their Midrashes or Expositions prove, particularly upon this text of Zechariah. Some commentators connecting the epithet "lowly" with the degraded state of the Ass at the time of the Incarnation, have made this entrance of the Saviour into Jerusalem an instance of his humility, instead of setting it forth as an accomplishment of a prophecy which spake of him as Messiah the Prince, upon whose shoulders the government was laid. Of old it was accounted honourable in Judea to ride on Asses. See Num. xxii. 21, Judges v. 10, 2 Sam. xvi. 2. Patriarchs, Princes, and Judges used them until horses were multiplied in the days of Solomon: and however mean and despised the Ass had become when the Sceptre was

* The English Version affords similar instances to confirm the word *poor* as the proper translation of יָנִי: amongst others, see Deut. xxiv. 14, 15. Job xxiv. 9, 14.—xxvi. 15.—xxix. 12. Ps. x. 2, 9.—xiv. 6.—xxxv. 10. Isa. xxvi. 6. Zech. vii. 10.

departed from Judah, yet it was adapted to the character of Christ, as the Son of David, the king of Israel. "The multitudes" that hailed the arrival of the Lord's Christ, testified their sense of the fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy. They rejoiced, they shouted, they addressed Hosannas to him, saying, "Blessed be the king that cometh in the name of the Lord." They saw and knew him to be indeed "poor," *i. e.* in a low condition," "but * riding upon an Ass," they had no doubt of his Royal estate, and therefore acknowledged him to be "the king of the Jews."

Several circumstances which attended this memorable transaction agree with the view taken of the subject before us. "Much people that were come to the feast took branches of palm trees [the emblems of Light and Victory] and went forth to meet him, and cried, Hosanna, blessed be the king of Israel." They confessed themselves to be the people that had walked in darkness, who then saw a great light. They declared that upon them who were dwelling in the land of the shadow of death a Light had shined. "Others cut down branches from the trees and strewed them in the way." They ascribed to Jesus what was intended by the emblematical tabernacles made with boughs in which the tribes of Israel dwelt when they celebrated the feast of tabernacles; viz. that he was Messiah their Coverer and protector, כַּפֶּרֶת, under whose shadow they were to abide. "And many spread their garments in the way:" proclaiming him to be their king, and paying the homage due to his regal dignity. They ascribed unto him "the kingdom and the power and the glory," and acknowledged themselves to be his subjects, as the princes of Israel had done in former times, when they "took every man his garment and put it under Jehu, and blew with trumpets saying, Jehu is king." Some of the pharisees among the multitude wished Jesus to rebuke his followers. They understood what was intended when "the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise

* is translated *but* in Prov. xiv. 12.

God with a loud voice, saying, Blessed be the king that cometh in the name of the Lord; peace in heaven, and glory in the highest." They plainly saw that he was "poor," *i. e.* in a low condition, "but" seeing also that he came "riding upon an Ass," the predicted mark of his Royalty, their understandings were convinced of that which their hearts would not confess, that the words of Zechariah were now accomplished: "Rejoice greatly, O Daughter of Zion: shout O Daughter of Jerusalem: Behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is poor [in a low condition] but riding upon an Ass."

A slight examination into the history and practices of the heathen nations, as well as the believing Jews, will afford sufficient evidence to support the assertion so often made, that Jesus the Christ of God was not only King of Israel, but existed as such before his manifestation in the flesh in the last days. The Jews worshipped Christ before he came on earth, under the name of King and Anointed, as their different services and the language of the Psalms fully testify. And that this was no anticipation of a future existence, but the description of One then in being, is proved by the prophet Isaiah, "Mine eyes have seen the King": * which

* The words which immediately follow the above quotation from Isa. vi. 5, in the English Version, will be considered as subversive of the Creature-character of Christ: viz. "Mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord [Jehovah] of hosts." But, beside that it is impossible that Jehovah could be seen of the prophet, it does not follow that no other rendering ought or can be given to the concluding words of this verse. They may be translated, "Mine eyes have seen the King, O Lord [Jehovah] of hosts." Or, "Mine eyes have seen the King of the Lord [Jehovah] of hosts." Similar to which is the language, and ought also to be the rendering of Ps. xxiv. 8—10. "Who *is* this King, the Gloried One, *הַכְּבוֹד*, which cannot be translated "Of Glory."] O Lord [Jehovah] strong and mighty, O Lord [Jehovah] mighty in battle? Who *is* He, this King, the Gloried One, *הַכְּבוֹד*, O Lord [Jehovah] of hosts?" Or, "Who *is* this King, the Gloried One, of the Lord [Jehovah] strong and mighty, of the Lord [Jehovah] mighty in battle? Who *is* He this King, the Gloried One, *הַכְּבוֹד*, of the Lord [Jehovah] of hosts?" The answer, or rather the right reference is given in ver. 4, 5. "He that

King, John says, was Christ, of whom Isaiah spake, "when he saw his glory." Jehovah is indeed King of kings, the blessed and only Potentate, but he hath set up ONE from the beginning, to whom he hath given all power in heaven and in earth. Of this Universal Monarch it is spoken, "Yea all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him." He is "King of kings and Lord of lords." Whether Herod believed that Jesus the Son of Mary was this King is immaterial: he acknowledged and promised to pay the homage that is due to Him unto whom is given "dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages should serve him." For when the Magi said that they were come to worship the King of the Jews, he said, "And when ye have found him, bring me word again, that I may come and worship him also." There were not only predictions among the Jews, but a universal tradition among the most distant heathen, of a king that was to be born in Judea. And from the knowledge which the Magi had of the appearance in the heavens which was to denote the time of his birth, from their offerings, their worship, and other circumstances, no doubt can be entertained that they had more exalted notions of this King, than as the head of a poor scattered nation, then in slavery to the Romans. The heathens also crowned their sacrifices, both human and brute: and this typical action proved what the great expiatory sacrifice was in their opinion: for this and other royal honours paid to the sacrifices, showed that they not only intended some thing more than the creature which they offered, but that this King whom they set forth is the type was to them, and would be to succeeding generations a Universal Monarch and Deliverer. It is certain that all the heathen treated their kings with a degree of veneration approaching nearly, if not entirely, equal to that which they

hath clean hands, and a pure heart; who hath not lift up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully." "He is the King, the Gloried One." "He shall receive the blessing from the Lord [Jehovah], and righteousness from the God of his salvation."

paid to their gods. The later Kings and Emperors among them, not content with gifts of gold and frankincense, imagined that they had a right to still higher degrees of homage than they had received. And as their empire became more extended, they not only expected universal adoration, but commanded the gifts of gold to be made into images like unto themselves, and the odoriferous gums and spices to be burned in the temples before their images.

To the Scriptures, however, reference must be had to prove, that such a king, as the Jews looked for, and Herod confessed was to be expected, had actually existed, and had appeared unto the Church from the earliest period. The various instances of this kind which have been adduced, it will be unnecessary now to bring to the reader's recollection.

Mal. iii. 1. "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts."

The application which the Saviour made of this Scripture to himself and his forerunner, makes it impossible to err in respect to the persons of whom the prophet speaks. We learn from the record in the Evangelists Matthew and Luke, that the Messenger who was to prepare the way was John the Baptist; and that the Lord **יהוה** who was to come suddenly to his temple was Jesus the Christ. Haggai had, about one hundred and twenty years before, foretold the latter event in somewhat similar terms. "I will shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts." The words of Malachi are, "He, who is made The Director, Ruler, or Lord, **יהוה**, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple": shall take upon him that body which is prepared for him, (See John ii. 19—21.) "even the Messenger of the Covenant whom ye delight him: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord [Jehovah] of hosts." It is not Jehovah that was to be Incarnate, but

One to whom the rule and the power had been given, and must therefore be then existing; of whom Jehovah speaks: He who is made Director, Ruler, Lord, (for such is the meaning of the word מֶלֶךְ) shall suddenly come, &c.: and of course he must then have positively existed to be an object of delight and desire: "Behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts." "Sacrifice and offering [of the type] thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me. Then said I, lo, I come."

Matt. xxii. 41—45. "While the pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is he? They say unto him, *The Son of David*. He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord, saying, Jehovah said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his Son?"

The question with which this short conversation between Christ and the pharisees began, though seemingly fraught with no great importance, led to a result which confounded his enemies, and imposed silence on them whose hearts were not filled with the same bitterness against him. Both were alike convicted of ignorance on a fundamental point of their common faith. Like that Master in Israel who knew not that he must be born again before he could enter into the kingdom of God, they had an important truth to learn, viz. that Jesus who was called Christ, was the Root as well as the offspring of David. If, as was probably the case, there were no disputes in those days whether Messiah, when he came, would be descended of Joseph or of David, it appears however that his person and character were not rightly understood by the pharisees to whom Jesus directed his discourse. "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is he?" Q. D. Ye acknowledge that such a Person is to come, to whom ye look for deliverance from your enemies. And when he shall come, what House or Lineage shall give him birth? They say without hesitation, He who is the Desire of all nations,

and in whom all the nations of the earth shall be blessed, "is the Son of David." If so, Jesus saith, How came it to pass that David under the teaching of the Spirit called him Lord : *i. e.* admitted a superiority or precedence not only in rank but in time, saying, as it is read in Psalm cx. 1, "Jehovah said unto my Lord אֲדֹנָי, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." It is not written, Jehovah would say when Messiah should come into existence, but Jehovah said unto him who was then in being, and called Lord : Sit in the seat of honour, until I subdue thine enemies under thee. If David then called him Lord, how can you reconcile that truth that he is also his Son? If superior, how subordinate? If before him in time and rank, how posterior in both? So unacquainted were Christ's hearers with the foundation on which the church of God was laid, that "no man was able to answer him a word." And being convicted in their own hearts of an incapacity to argue with him on any subject of which Moses and the prophets had written, "neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions."

The present state of the Church of God on this very subject, disposes the reflecting mind to cease from surprise at the ignorance of a portion of the seed of Abraham on this turning point of their creed, as well as their ceremonial worship. "A man can receive nothing except it be given him from heaven," was the language of John Baptist in those days. And at no time, whatever education may effect in other things, can any natural man receive or even know the things of the Spirit of God, because they are spiritually discerned. We, like the Pharisees, have the Sacred Scriptures in our hands, but they will be a dead letter to us as they were to them, unless the Spirit of God shall open our understandings. They could not see how David's Son in the flesh could be David's Lord, the object of his love and adoration a thousand years before his Incarnation. Nor can we, unless He, who opened the eyes of the blind, shall open the eyes of our

mind to see, that he who "is before all things, and by whom all things consist," did in the time appointed of the Father become partaker of flesh and blood, that he might make peace through the blood of his cross. Mark closes his account of this discourse with these memorable words: "And the common people heard him gladly." However averse the Pharisees or scribes, or all the rulers might be to the doctrine of a Pre-existent Lord and Saviour, as the Son, Servant, and Creature of Jehovah, or to acknowledge the Son of Mary to be him manifested in the flesh, not a few of the Jews received both it and him: for "the common people heard him gladly." Nor did flesh and blood reveal it unto them, but their Father which is in heaven; for so it seemed good in his sight.

John i. 14, 15, 29, 30. "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth. John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for he was before me.—The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me."

Some preceding verses in this chapter have been discussed, and from their internal evidence, as well as from the concurrent testimony of Scripture in general, and this Apostle's writings in particular, they have been considered as decisive, in proving the existence of the Man Jesus Christ to have been before the foundation of the world. The 14th verse is again introduced, as containing an important, because a terminating, link in the chain of Scripture evidence, as well as of human reasoning, on this subject. The term *Λόγος* "Word" in this verse, *ὁ ἀμνος* "The Lamb" in the 29th, and *ἄνθρωπος* "Man" in the 30th, form a connected and irrefragable testimony that Jesus Christ was a Man, the Lamb slain

from the foundation of the world, and the Word that was in the beginning with God. The Saviour, the Lord from heaven, stands confessed in all the glories of his pre-existing dignity, as far as the veil of the flesh, which he took in the fulness of the time, would permit, ver. 14. This will appear as we proceed.

In reply to the priests and Levites that were sent from Jerusalem to ask John Baptist, who art thou? though a prophet and more than a prophet, he laid little stress upon his own honourable distinction as the forerunner of Messiah, but directed their attention to Jesus the Christ as alone worthy of their notice. "There standeth one among you, whom ye know not, he it is who coming after me is preferred before me, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose." And, "The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." As if he had said, Behold him of whom it is written "He is a man of sorrows." "He is brought as a Lamb to the slaughter." "He bare the sin of many." "Jehovah is well pleased for his righteousness sake: he will magnify the Law, and make it honourable." But there is another peculiarity, of which this harbinger of the Lord's Christ spake when he announced his arrival: viz. that he was not only more excellent than himself in his character and office, but that he had a singular pre-eminence in having existed before him. A reference to the history will prove that John existed some months prior to Jesus in the flesh. How then was Jesus before him? In the same manner that he was before Abraham, and as he was David's Lord one thousand years before he was manifested on earth in the flesh: i. e. by being, "In the Beginning—by being, "The Beginning, God's way,"—"The beginning of the creation of God." "This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for he was before *πρωτος* me." ver. 15. "This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me, for he was before *πρωτος* me." ver.

30. Who is this that was before John Baptist? or what is the antecedent noun in construction with *πρῶτος* in these two verses? With respect to ver. 15, there can be no doubt. "He of whom" John Baptist "spake," according to the testimony of the Evangelist in ver. 14, was *Λόγος*, "The Word"; but not the Body, Tabernacle or Incarnation of the Word: That was "He that cometh after" John Baptist. The Word, which was in the beginning, and six months after the Baptist's birth was made flesh, was "He" that "was before" him. The essential character of the Word, who was in the beginning, is declared in what immediately follows. "We beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten * of

* In the Received Translation, *μονογενής* has a different rendering when it refers to the Son of God, to what it has when it speaks of the offspring of men. This is not surprising when the creed of every age since the second century after the Incarnation is considered. In three instances, Luke vii. 12.—viii. 42.—ix. 38, it is translated "The only," meaning Son or Daughter. In John's writings it is, in every place where it occurs, uniformly rendered "The only begotten," referring to God's dear Son. It has the same rendering once in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. xi. 17, as an epithet given to Isaac. *Μονογενής*, which is found in the New Testament only in the passages above cited, is used by the LXX. as the rendering of *יחיד*, "An only, single, solitary one," in Ps. xxii. 21.—xxv. 16.—xxxv. 27. Aquila translates *יחיד* in Ps. xxii. 21.—xxxv. 17, by *μοναχῆς*. Symmachus by *μονογενῆς*. Aquila also renders *יחיד*, in Ps. xxv. 16, by *μοναχῆς*. Symmachus by *μονος*. So much for their united opinion of the force of the term *יחיד*; and from that opinion the sense of *μονογενής* is "The only." In John i. 14, it speaks of the Son of God as an "Only One in a peculiar point of view." That something important was attached by our translators to the term "Begotten" is certain. The advocates for the Eternal Generation of the Son of God can best tell what that was. But in that case ought they to have omitted the word "Begotten" in any instance, if it was included in the epithet *μονογενής*? The texts above quoted from the New Testament are not however the only examples of inconsistency, in relation to this word, on the part of the translators of the English Bible. They have rendered *μονογενής* in the Apocryphal Book of Tobit, chap. iii. 15.—vi. 10, by "Only," and "One only"; in the Book of Wisdom, chap. vii. 22, by "One only"; but in Tobit, chap. viii. 17, and in the margin of Wisdom, chap. vii. 22, by "Only begotten." Highly as these great and good men should be esteemed for their labours, it ought not to be forgotten, that they were men, who, like their fellows, had

the Father." This could not be the fleshly tabernacle; for that had no glory, no form nor comeliness, no beauty, that we should desire it. The Word was despised and rejected

not in this state of being "already attained, or were already perfect." If, instead of adopting the sentiments of past ages, they had used their own understandings on this as on other subjects, they might, and probably would have seen, that in point of fact a Son or Daughter may be an "Only" Son or Daughter, but not an "Only-Begotten" Son or Daughter, in the sense usually attached to the word "Begotten." But did not the use of the term "Begotten," in the rendering of *μονογενής*, arise from a mistaken idea of its meaning? Did not the translators intend it should convey the signification which is implied in the act of Filiation, viz. the bringing something into Being which had no previous existence? *Μονογενής* has no reference to the production into Being, but only to the manifestation of that of which it is predicated: and it has respect only to the fact of what it was, when so manifested, produced, or brought forth. *Γινώσκει*, or *γινώσκω*, *γενέσθαι*, *γενίσκεσθαι*, signify no more than the act of producing or exhibiting in a new state of existence what was already in being. It is the passive of the old verb *γενω* or *γενωμι*, to "produce or bring forth." Whatever diversity of expression may be employed to suit the variety of cases to which this verb is applied, the leading idea of being brought from an antecedent to another state of existence, by the act of an extraneous cause, is always necessary to be, in some way or other, made sensible in a translation before it can be deemed accurate or faithful. *Μονογενής*, as predicated of the Son of God, speaks only of his existence as being notable for its singularity or peculiarity. It refers to no way or manner by which that existence was brought about. *Μονογενής*, *q. d.* *μόνος ἐγενετο*, "He was being the Only One," according to that manner in which he subsisted: and this subsistence, whether considered before or in his Incarnation, was of a peculiar kind or manner. As the Pre-existent Lord, "the First-born of every creature," "the First-born among many brethren," he was being the Only One of the human species, who was before Incarnation perfect in all the parts, powers, and faculties, which constitute Humanity; they being brought into their full display and exercise when Jehovah "possessed Him, the Beginning, his Way, before his works," and "formed all things by Him." Not less singular was his subsistence in his Incarnation. Jesus Christ in the outward as well as in the inward man was *μονογενής*, an Only Son, in a sense peculiar to Himself. *Μόνος ἐγενετο*, "He was the Only One" of his kind: no one else was like him. Who was born of a Virgin without the intervention of man but Himself? Who else was raised from the dead to die no more?—to be exalted to the right hand of God?—to be made heir of all things, because he became obedient to death, even the death of a Cross?

on that account. It must be the Essential Glory of the Word: and this glory, which he had with the Father before the world began, when it burst through the earthly house of his tabernacle, was seen by him who made this record, together with Peter and James. And this glory being seen by the Apostles, must be a Creature Glory; for the uncreated glory of God no man hath seen or can see. The Word was being *εγενετο* flesh *also*,* and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the Only of his Father.

With respect to the antecedent noun in concord with *πρῶτος* in verse 30, it must be *ανηρ* "a Man." The advocates for the Incarnation of Jehovah deny that *ανηρ* "a Man" can refer both to him that came after, and to him that was before John. According to them "After me cometh a Man *ανηρ*," denotes merely the seed of the woman. "He was before *πρῶτος* me," points they say to the pre-existent Lord, Jehovah Son. For in this place they contend, that a Being pre-existent to the fleshy tabernacle, and inhabiting it, must be intended.

But does the context in any part of this chapter (See Ch. VI. under John i. 1, 2, 14) lead us to see Deity as the wonderful and glorious Person that pre-existed and became incarnate? From verse 19, beginning with the record of John Baptist, to the words under consideration, nothing presents itself to our notice but what forces upon us the idea of a Creature-character in Him who is called "Christ," "Jesus," "The Lamb of God." The New Testament writers in the use of the word *ανηρ* "a Man," as well as *ανθρωπος* "a Man," intended generally the complex creature Man compounded of what is termed Body and Soul. The instances, however, are not rare, in which *ανηρ* as well as *ανθρωπος* mean sometimes

* The English Version, viz. "The Word was made flesh," though undesignedly, has adopted the Eutychian heresy, viz. that Christ had but One nature, after the Two natures were united. Mere union, and more cannot be inferred from the expression, *ὁ Λόγος σαφὲς ἑγενετο*, cannot make one thing to be another. Nothing but a positive change of This into That, as when "Water was made Wine," can effect it.

the Body or Outward Man merely, without the Soul: and the Soul or Inward Man simply, without the Body. Luke i. 34, "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man *ανδρα*—John iv. 16, 17, "Jesus saith unto her, Go, call thy husband *ανδρα*—the woman answered and said, I have no husband *ανδρα*." In these Scriptures *ανδρα* cannot mean the Soul or Inward Man, for that has no distinction of sex. Luke v. 12, "Behold, a man *ανη* full of leprosy." Acts iii. 2, "A certain man *ανη* lame from his mother's womb." In neither of these Scriptures can the Soul or Inward Man be intended, since neither leprosy nor lameness can be spoken of it. Acts vi. 5, "They chose Stephen a man *ανδρα* full of faith and of the Holy Ghost." Acts x. 22, "Cornelius, the Centurion, a just man *ανη* and one that feared God." In these two instances the Soul or Inward Man alone is intended, as the compound creature consisting of both body and soul is clearly set forth in the following. 1 Cor. vii. 13, "And the woman which hath an husband *ανδρα* that believeth not." Faith, Righteousness, Godly fear, being Spiritual gifts, are as peculiar to the Soul or Inward Man as sexual distinction is to the body or outward man. As Paul says, "I know that in me, that is in my Flesh dwelleth no good thing."—And—"I delight in the law of God after the Inward Man."

Thus Holy Writ in the word *ανη*, verse 30, does not lead us to the contemplation of an undefined abstract Being, of whose real character we have no experience, and of whom the understanding is not capable of fully comprehending whence and who he is, and what is his work and office. We have no allusion to a Human Nature, something possessing all that constitutes a Person, yet devoid of Personality. But we are presented with Man, the Inward Man, as an Individual so separate and distinct from all Beings whatever, that no union with any other than its appropriate partner the Outward Man is capable of producing a Numerical Oneness.*

* The use of *ανθρωπος* in the New Testament is similar to *ανη*, and leads us to the same conclusion. Matt. ix. 32, "Behold they brought to him

If Scripture is to be its own interpreter, if a legitimate conclusion is to be drawn from Scriptural premises, which are accompanied with no difficulties of construction, nor any of doctrine, but such as originate from educational prejudices, and are fostered by them, the result in this case will be encumbered with no doubts. It may without hesitation be pronounced that He, whom John Baptist declares was before him, was Man, not the fleshy tabernacle, that was impossible, it being born six months after him; but *ανηρ*, "the Inward Man," according to verse 30, and *ὁ Λογος*, "the Word," according to verse 14. And if He who was before John Baptist in verse 30 was a Man *ανηρ*, not in the fleshy state, but as the Inward Man; if He who was before John Baptist in verse 15 was the Word *ὁ Λογος*, not in the fleshy state, but in that pristine glory which he had with the Father before the world was, are we not authorized to draw this conclusion from these Scriptural premises: viz. that *ανηρ* a Man without the Body, and *ὁ Λογος* the Word in his glory that he had before he was made flesh, are One and the same Being?

John viii. 25. "Then said they unto him, Who art thou? And Jesus said unto them, even *the same* that I said unto you from the beginning."

Was it that our translators were ignorant that the Man Jesus Christ was in existence before the world began, that

a dumb man *ανδραπων*." Luke vii. 25, "A man *ανδραπων* clothed in soft raiment." Luke vii. 34, "A gluttonous man *ανδραπων* and a wine-bibber." John vii. 22, "Ye on the sabbath day circumcise a man *ανδραπων*." Heb. ix. 27, "It is appointed unto men *ανδραπων* once to die." In all these instances the Body or Outward Man alone can be understood. Rom. vii. 22, "I delight in the law of God after the Inward Man *ανδραπων*." 2 Cor. xii. 2, "I knew a man *ανδραπων* in Christ—whether in the body I cannot tell, or whether out of the body I cannot tell." James i. 7, "Let not that man *ανδραπων* think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord." In all these Scriptures the Soul or Inward Man alone is intended. And the opposition and contradistinction of the soul from the body in the use of the word *ανδραπων* is evident in the following passage. 2 Cor. iv. 16, "Though our Outward Man *ὁ ἐξω ανδραπων* perish, yet the Inward Man *ὁ ἐσωθεν* is renewed day by day."

they inadvertently rendered the verb *ελεω* in the past time "I said," instead of "I say" in the present, and gave a sense to *αρχην* which neither its case nor the construction of the sentence will admit? The Greek and Latin authors have been, and not very successfully, quoted in the use of an ellipsis to give a colour to the mistranslation of the latter word, but no effort has been made to cover the defect of the former. The Vulgate, *Principium quod et loquor vobis*, "Even that which I say unto you, The Beginning," is a literal version of the Greek, expressing fully the doctrine in question, whether those translators understood it or not. The following Scriptures speak the same truth in a way too plain to be the subject of cavil. Col. i. 18, "And he is the head of the body, the Church: who is the Beginning *αρχη*, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." Rev. iii. 14, "These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the Beginning *αρχη* of the creation of God." To these the context adds a further corroboration. "Jesus answered and said unto them, though I bear record of myself yet my record is true: for I know whence I come and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I come and whither I go."—"I go my way, and ye shall die in your sins."—"If ye believe not that I am *he*, ye shall die in your sins." "Then said they unto him, who art thou? And Jesus saith unto them, Even that I say unto you, The Beginning."

John viii. 24, 58. "If ye believe not that I am *he*, ye shall die in your sins—Before Abraham was, I am."

The obligations which the Church of God in this country is under to the great and good Men who gave us the Holy Scriptures in the English tongue are beyond the power of language fully to express. But since it cannot be denied, that as Men they were not only liable to err, but have actually committed many important mistakes, so it is necessary for the furtherance of the great cause which they were anxious to promote, to lay open without hesitation, yet in the spirit of meekness and love, every instance wherein it is obvious that they have

opposed the truth which they intended to establish. The Pre-existence of the Man Jesus Christ was a topic to which their attention had not been drawn by the Spirit of God. Their total ignorance of the doctrine led the way to the otherwise unaccountable blunders in verse 25, of substituting the past for the present time in the word λαλω, and giving a translation of the word ερχην contrary to the idiom of the Greek tongue, as has been already observed. In rendering the 24th and 58th verses the same want of information not only led to the insertion of the word "he" required by no antecedent, but in two instances to the rejection of a sense which they had adopted in another place, where it was obvious to them that εἰμι could not be properly translated by "I am."—"Jesus saith unto him, Have I been εἰμι so long time with you?" John xiv. 9. If this had been attended to in verse 24, it might have led the way to a right understanding of verses 24 and 58, "If ye believe not that I have been εἰμι, [before I came into the world, "for I know whence I came and whither I go,"] ye shall die in your sins." "Then said they unto him, Who art thou? And Jesus said unto them, That which I say unto you, The beginning—Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily I say unto you Before Abraham was, I have been, εἰμι." Nor needed our Reformers to have hesitated at that view of the subject, as the language of Christ in two preceding verses pointed immediately to it. "I know whence I come and whither I go; but ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go." verse 14. "Ye are from beneath, I am from above." verse 23. As also does the language of the Apostle in another place. "Every Spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God. And every Spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world." 1 John iv. 2, 3. And that this Jesus Christ is another than

Jehovah is plain from John xii. 41, "These things said Esaias when he saw his [Jesus'] glory, and spake of him." In Is. vi. 1, "The Prophet saw Adoni [not Jehovah] sitting," &c. In verse 8, "He also heard the voice of Adoni [not Jehovah] uttering the words quoted immediately before John declared that "Esaias saw the glory of Jesus, and spake of him." The application of Adoni to Jesus is also to be seen in that well known passage "Jehovah said to Adoni sit thou," &c. Ps. cx. 1.—"If ye believe not that I have been, ye shall die in your sins—Before Abraham was, I have been—was—existed." It is not unusual in the Greek idiom, especially when the action or state of the verb is understood as continued to the present time, for the Present to be taken in the sense of the Past. See Luke xv. 31. John ix. 25. Eph. ii. 1, 5.

John xvii. 4, 5, 22, 24. "I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given to them; that they may be one even as we are one: Father, I will that those whom thou hast given me be with me where I am: that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world."

When the nature of the glory which Jesus Christ had, and the time he possessed it shall be considered, his Pre-existence as a Man will be evident from this part also of Holy Writ. The Redeemer begins with stating in the words here selected that he had glorified God on earth, and had finished the work he had given him to do: and then proceeds in prayer, saying, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Jesus speaks of a glory which he had before he was manifested in the flesh, of which he "emptied himself," and prays to have it restored to him. Was this the glory of Deity? What follows makes it impossible. "And the glory which thou

gavest me, I have given them." Again—"Father, I will that those also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me." According to the orthodox scheme the glory of Deity is and ever must be the property of each person in the Godhead. But if this glory were for a while voluntarily suspended in any one of the persons, in regard to its manifestation, or he were for a season to empty himself of it, yet the glory of Deity could not be the gift of any one to the other; each being inherently because essentially possessed of it. And as this glory therefore was not that of Deity, is it not obvious that it was the glory of a creature? A subsequent verse proves it to be so. "And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one." Not only was the glory, which Jesus had, a gift, and therefore not his own essentially, and consequently not that of Deity, but he declares that this glory which he had from the Father, he had given to the men which the Father gave him out of the world! and with this particular design, that a similar union, certainly not of Numerical Oneness, might be among them as was between the Father and his Son, the Man Jesus Christ.

The language of Jesus, whom God had made both Lord and Christ, was in substance this. "I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do" in "the body of my humiliation" * while on earth. And now, O Father, take me to thyself in heaven, from whence I the Inward Man, *το σωμα της δόξης* "the body of glory," but now "the humbled body," *το σωμα της ταπεινώσεως*, came down, and glorify me with the outshinings of that glory which I had in thy presence from the beginning. The days of my appointed abasement are ended: restore quickly in the sight of Angels and the Spirits of just men made perfect, that honour and glory which I enjoyed with thee before the world was." Such was Jesus'.

* This was *το σωμα της δόξης* "the body of glory," but it was also *το σωμα της ταπεινώσεως*, the Inward Man covered with the sackcloth of flesh, and so a humbled body.

glory; not necessarily inherent or essential, but the glory of a creature, and the gift of the Father to his beloved Son.

As the glory of Jesus was a created excellence, so there is a time recorded when it had its first existence. It was a glory which he, whom the Father loved before the foundation of the world, had with him before the world *κοσμον* was—"for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world *κοσμου*." This was not a glory set up in an Ideal plan of God's future dealings with his Church according to some; or fixed by an Absolute decree to appear at an appointed time according to others; but a real glory enjoyed by the Son in a Pre-existent state in the presence of God. "Jehovah possessed me," says the Son in a certain place, "the Beginning, his Way, the First of his Works—Then I was by him, *as* one brought up *with him*: and I was daily his delights, rejoicing always before him."

1 Cor. x. 9. "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents."

As Paul was one of those holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, implicit credit is due to his words. Evasion from what is their plain and literal sense seems impossible in this place. Recourse cannot be had to a Prolepsis, or the figure of anticipation. A fact is mentioned, and the names of the parties concerned in it recorded. Israel tempted Christ and was destroyed of serpents. These circumstances having occurred in the days of Moses, Christ must have existed at that time: therefore his Pre-existence before he appeared in the flesh is certain. But who is he that is called Christ? It will be necessary to consider the force of the word and its use in Scripture: whether it has any relation to Him who is the First Cause, or is appropriate only to a creature: whether it elucidates the character of Jehovah or God, or stands in opposition to it. משיח, Messiah—Χριστος, Christ, *Anointed*, is a name that refers to the three great offices of King, Prophet, Priest, which the Redeemer was to fill. It has no relation to Jehovah or God, as the following Scrip-

tures prove. "The rulers take counsel against Jehovah and his Messiah." Ps. ii. 2. "Thou Jehovah wentest forth [N.B. The context proves that the verb *הָיָה* must be in the past time, "Thou wentest forth."] for the salvation of thy people, even for salvation with thy Messiah." Hab. iii. 13. "Peter said thou art the Christ of God." Luke ix. 20. "Let him save himself; if he be Christ the chosen of God." Luke xxiii. 35. "God hath made that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ." Acts ii. 36. "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ the Father of the glory *τῆς δόξης* may give," &c. Eph. i. 17. "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's." 1 Cor. iii. 23. "The head of Christ is God." Eph. i. 17. "Forgiving one another even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." Eph. iv. 2. "There is but one God and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5. "Now is come the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ." Rev. xii. 10. "They shall be priests of God, and of Christ." Rev. xi. 6. In each of these texts the term Christ is so clearly put in opposition to Jehovah or God, that if its sense which is evidently indicative of a creature did not decide its signification, there could be no doubt but He whom it sets forth is not Jehovah, but the creature of his hand, that first and most glorious of his works, the Man Jesus Christ, who is thus plainly declared of Paul to have had an existence before his manifestation in the flesh.*

* If it should be objected that Moses in Numb. xxi. 5, speaks only of *אלהים Aleim*, "And the people spake against Aleim," &c. and the Psalmist, "They tempted and provoked *עליון אלהים Aleim Most High*," it may be replied, that Aleim is not a Proper name but a relative term which has reference to the subjects of Jehovah's grace and dominion. When therefore Messiah is said to be Aleim, *i. e.* *לֵאלֹהִים*, in the place of Jehovah Aleim, or Jehovah in his character of grace and dominion, the obligation of worshipping or honouring Messiah, is because all power and authority is given to him to confer grace and to execute judgment on whom he will. The reason why Jehovah was pleased to commit this power of judgment unto Messiah is thus expressed: "The Father hath given to the Son authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son

Phil. ii. 5—11. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus: who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

It has been justly remarked, that it is more difficult to unlearn what has been erroneously imbibed in our early years, than to acquire correct information on subjects altogether new. The knowledge that is treasured up in youth, is, in relation to things of this world, very commonly, and on religious topics, almost always the result of listening to the opinions and sentiments of our instructors. Reflection on what has been heard, or discrimination between truth and error, in the points enforced and received, has seldom any place. And what is laid up in the memory for future use, or adopted for immediate practice, being considered as founded on the accumulated wisdom of many past ages, it is almost as impossible to be persuaded that the principles and opinions which we entertain are erroneous, as for the Ethiopian to change his skin, or the leopard his spots.

of Man": i. e. as a reward for his Incarnation, and the tremendous consequences which ensued: therefore that body, in which he did away sin and fulfilled all righteousness, was to be exalted to joy and glory, and to be the object of the Father's love, and of the adoration of the whole family in heaven and earth. As it is written: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him and set him at his own right hand, and hath given him a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

Few passages of Scripture more strikingly elucidate the truth of these observations than that which is now proposed as the subject of consideration. Good men and learned in their generation, have age after age agreed to surrender their understandings to the dictates of their predecessors, or what is the same to receive their determinations without bringing them to the test of Scriptural consistency. By such we are told that no portion of Holy Writ is more decisive of the Incarnation of Jehovah than this. Yet if the acknowledged sense of words is to be our guide, no Scripture speaks more plainly of the Incarnation of that glorious Being, that Son and Servant, that First-born of every creature, who was in the bosom of the Father, and came down from heaven, not to do his own will but the will of him that sent him.

The design of the Apostle is evidently to inculcate humility from the example of Christ. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." Independent of the impossibility of the term Christ * being predicated of Deity, which would be sufficient to overturn the argument *in limine*, it may be urged that there is no Scripture which commands a conformity with God in humility. Here again we might make our stand and contend that the Apostle could not propose this example in any other way than as a creature example. But to proceed to consider the passage in detail: for which the importance of the subject, as well as the nature of the terms in which it is expressed, will be a sufficient excuse.

"Who being in the form $\mu\omicron\rho\Phi\eta$ of God." $\mu\omicron\rho\Phi\eta$ signifies the "outward appearance, show, or form," (Doricè $\mu\omicron\rho\Phi\alpha$, hence Parkhurst says by transposition *Forma*.) and has no relation to Essence.† It is not therefore said that Christ

* To be anointed, signifies, to be raised above others by some honour or authority conferred by a superior. It is in effect to say, that the One Anointed is at least a delegate, and therefore not the same with him who sent him.

† In Job iv. 16, חֲמוּתָה *A delineation*, or *similitude*, and in Isaiah xlv. 13, תְּבִינָה *A form, pattern*, or *model*, are rendered by $\mu\omicron\rho\Phi\eta$ in the LXX. Version. As far as this authority goes, what has $\mu\omicron\rho\Phi\eta$ *Deo* to do with Jesus Christ as Very God?

Jesus was God himself, but only in outward appearance, show, or semblance as God. This honour was given to Christ Jesus. He is "the brightness of Glory" and "the image of God." Jesus Christ being thus in the form of God,* took his place, was instead of God, spake and acted for him, being God's viceroy, his Angel, and "the Messenger of the Covenant." Exalted and honoured in this manner before and under the Mosaic dispensation, "he thought it not robbery to be as *ισα* God: *i. e.* to exercise the power with which he was endowed as the representative of the Father, and to accompany that exercise with a display of the glory which he had with him before the world was, and to receive that honour and adoration from Angels and men which the Father had commanded. The use of *ισα* to express likeness and not identity, has sufficient authority to recommend it to the Scholar and to the Christian. Many instances occur in the LXX. version,† as also in the heathen Clas-

* If *μορφη θεου* means "Very God," as most Expositors of Scripture make it, then the passage must run thus—"Who being Very God, thought it not robbery to be equal to Very God." But if not "Very God," then Christ is evidently spoken of by *μορφη θεου* in contradistinction to Very God, and if in contradistinction to him, he cannot be what *θεος* here signifies, The First Cause.

† In the following passages *ισα* is the rendering of a prefixed כ, a particle of *restriction* or *limitation*, from כח to *restrain*.

Ετυρωσας με *ισα* τυρω.—Job. x. 10.

"Thou hast curdled me as cheese."

Ο παλαιωται *ισα* αση.—Job. xiii. 28.

"Which grows old as a bottle of skin."

Πινων αδικιας *ισα* ποτη.—Job. xv. 16.

"Drinking iniquity as his beverage."

Χορτον *ισα* βουσιν βοθιουσιν.—Job. xl. 15.

"They eat grass as oxen."

As a farther confirmation that the LXX. interpreters intended *ισα* to express likeness and not identity, they have put it for מְשַׁלֵּם, *resemblances*, in their version of Job xiii. 12.

Αποβησεται δε υμων το γαυριασμα *ισα* σποδη.

"Your boasting shall become as dust."

sics.* *Ισοι*† is rendered “like” by our translators in Acts xi. 17, “Forasmuch then as God gave them the like *ισην* gift as *he did* unto us:” as it is also in this chapter, ver. 29, “I have no man like minded *ισοψυχον*.” Scriptures themselves have moreover made it synonymous with *ως*, “as.” ‡ “In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the Angels *ως αγγελοι* of God in heaven.” Matt. xxii. 30. “Neither can they die any more for they are as the Angels, *ισαγγελοι*.” Luke xx. 36. § The Apostle’s mean-

* The following extracts are made from the writings of Homer, to shew the force of the neuter plural *ισα* when used adverbially.

Ος ρα νοθος μετην, πυκα διτρεφε δια Θειαν
Ισα φιλοισι τιμασσι, χαριζομενη ποσει φ.—Il. v. l. 70, 71.

“Who though he was a bastard, yet the noble Theano, to please her husband, brought up carefully as her beloved children.”

Ναις δε παρ Πριαμω οδμεν τιν *ισα* τιμασσι.—Il. xij. l. 176.

“He lived with Priam: and he regarded him as *his* children.

Ον ναι

Ισα φιλοισι τιμεισιν ετιομεν.—Il. xv. l. 438, 439.

“Whom we honoured as *our* dear parents.”

Ισα δε μεν κατη αλοχη τιν.—Odyss. i. l. 432.

“He honoured her as *his own* chaste wife.”

Τι μιν δε λελογχασιν ισα θεοισι.—Odyss. xi. l. 303.

“They have obtained honour as the Gods.”

Πριν μιν γαρ σε ζων ετιομεν ισα θεοισιν.—Odyss. xi. l. 483.

“Formerly when alive we honoured thee as the Gods.”

Τον νυν ισα θεω Ιθακασιν εσορουν.—Odyss. xv. l. 319.

“Him the Ithacans now look upon as a God.”

† It is certain that *Ισοι* admits of degrees of comparison, viz. *Ισοτατος*, and therefore cannot mean *Equal*, for nothing can be said to be more or less *equal* to another, though one thing may be more or less *like* to another.

‡ Hesychius has *ισον, ομοιον*, and Suidas, *ισα, τα ομοια*, as synonyms.

§ We must either read “as” here, in conformity with Matt. xxii. 30, or, with our Translators, and some of the purest English Classics, make “equal” to mean “like.” Whatever was the opinion or intention of the Translators, they have made *ως*, “as,” and *Ισοι*, “equal,” words of similar signification. See Matt. xxii. 30, and Luke xx. 36, compared with Acts xi. 17, and in so doing have given a clue to the understanding

ing therefore is, that Christ Jesus being invested with glory and honour from God, that he might receive homage from the heavenly host before he made the world, and, after he had made it, from all that inhabit it, thought it no derogation to the honour of God, or to the subordination in which he stood as his creature, to assume the high place and assert the privilege to which he was appointed; viz. of being "as," "in the place" or "stead of" God,* to whatsoever is in heaven above, in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth.† See Ch. IV. Note under Rom. ix. 5.

"But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form a servant." "He made himself of no reputation *ἐκένωσε*," he emptied ‡ or divested himself of the glory he had

of John v. 18, a text quoted with great confidence, notwithstanding the context, (See ver. 19—27, and 30.) in proof of the Deity of the Son of God. "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was peculiarly his *ὁν* Father, (See Note p. 137.) making himself *ὡς* like or as God": the well known character of the expected Messiah.

* Jesus Christ was *ὡς τὸ θεῶν*, *i. e.* *ac, quasi*, "as, in the place of, or representative of God"—in that the Father by him "created [formed] all things,"—"framed or constituted the ages,"—"upon him placed the glory,"—"gave him to be Head over all things to the Church,"—"hath given him power over all things in heaven and in earth,"—"in whose face he shines,"—whom he hath made his "Image."

† Papists, in the pride and naughtiness of their hearts, style the head of their Church, Dominus et Deus noster, "our Lord and God." Blasphemous as their doctrines and practices are in many respects, it is doing them injustice to charge them with declaring the Pope to be what the general and allowed signification of the words import, viz. The First Cause, the Creator, as well as Ruler and Governor of all Things. The Pope claims no more than to be the Vicegerent of God, taking the place and exercising the authority of Christ on earth: *i. e.* to be what Paul foretold—"Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, [ἄν] or that is worshipped; so that he as God [ἄν] sitteth in the temple of God, [Jehovah] shewing himself that he is God:" or ἄν, El, *θεῶν*, the Mediator.

‡ *ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*, "He emptied himself." Who emptied himself? Not Deity, because He changeth not. Not that which was conceived of the Virgin, or the Tabernacle formed in her womb, because it then existed not. But some Pre-existent Person, who being "rich, became poor,"

with the Father before the world was, and in which he appeared as, in the place, or instead of God to the Patriarchs, &c. under the old dispensation. "And took upon him the form *μορφὴν* of a bond-servant *or* slave *δούλος*." It was the form or outward appearance only; for while Christ was on earth, he was actually a bond-servant or slave to no one. He consented to act and be esteemed as such by them who knew him not. He submitted to the servile office of washing his disciples' feet, but at the same time declared he was their Lord and Master. Such was the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, being the Maker, Upholder and Lord of all, yet for our sakes he became poor. He emptied or divested himself of all. Like a bond-servant or slave he had no property, he lived despised, and at last died the death of a condemned slave. The Pre-existent Creature-character of great power and glory which Christ had, and in which he appeared to the Patriarchs, &c. as or in the place of God before his Incarnation, was that which he put off when he was Incarnate, or took on him the fashion of the Outward Man and the form of a servant.

"And was made in the likeness of men." The copulative "and" in this, as in the former clause, is not in the original, which runs thus: "But he emptied himself, taking *λαβὼν* the form of a bond-servant *or* slave, being *γενομενος* in the likeness *ομοιωματι* of men." *i.e.* He who was before all things, when he came in the fulness of the time, was being of a woman, assuming a body or Outward Man, taking part of flesh and blood, because in all things it behoved him to be made like *ομοιωθῆναι* unto his brethren, who were part-takers of the same. This "likeness of men" denotes the Body or Outward frame which was prepared for him of the Father, as appears from the next words: "And being found," a Hebræism for "being," see 1 Pet. ii. 22. Matt. i. 18, "in

or emptied himself, and came down from heaven; and that by such a descent as answered to his subsequent ascension. Compare John xvi. 28, with Eph. iv. 9.

fashion *σχηματι* [the "figure, form, outline": *σχημα*, according to Constantine is *persona, habitus, species, lineamentum*.] as a man, he humbled himself, being *γενομενος* obedient unto death, even the death of the cross—"Wherefore God hath highly exalted him *αυτον*," the Outward Man or Body, for that alone could die, and that was assumed expressly for the suffering of death. "For to this end Christ both died, and rose and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." Rom. xiv. 9. "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels *אלהים* for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour." Heb. ii. 9. "And hath given him," *εχαρισματο αυτω*, dispensed as a matter of favour and free gift to him, the Outward Man, the seed of the woman, the Man that came after John Baptist, the Son of Man who was brought in vision to the Ancient of days,* the Pre-existent Lord, the Son of God, "a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus" the Son of Mary, and so the Son of Man, "every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and *things* under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ," the Child that was born, as well as the Son that was given, the Pre-existent Lord, the Son of God, "is Lord to the glory of God the Father."† Compare

* With what truth, or appearance of truth, can it be maintained, that the expression, "The Ancient of Days," denotes God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of "The Son of Man," The Messiah? What have days to do with Him who is without beginning and without end of days? *עתיק יומין*, "Ancient of Days," may speak of Him whose date is "In the beginning," but must be altogether inapplicable to Him who is without beginning.

† If any doubt remains on the subject, let it be asked, who was named Jesus? It was Mary's "first-born Son." Matt. i. 25. He who was "conceived in her" womb, Matt. i. 20, 21. The "Child circumcised on the eighth day." Luke ii. 21. Who then was exalted? Who had a Name given, &c. but the Body, the Outward and not the Inward Man? Who but the Son of Man—He of whom it was said, "This is the Carpenter's Son"—"We will not have this Man to reign over us"? The Son of God, the First-born of every creature, was the Lord of the Universe from the beginning. The Body which he assumed, was

Matt. xxiv. 30.—xxv. 31.—xxvi. 64. with Dan. vii. 9, 10, 13, 14.

“Col. i. 17. “And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.”

Whatever the Angels are of whom Paul speaks in this epistle, and learned men differ widely on the subject, his design was to shew that they are inferior to Christ in dignity and power. “He is before all things,” and consequently has a priority in time before angels. “And by him all things consist”; therefore he must also have a superiority over angels, whatever share they may have in ministering for them who shall be heirs of salvation. But here, as in other places, a question may be raised, who is this mighty and highly dignified person that has the precedence of all things in time, and by whose power all things subsist? Is the description which the Apostle gives suited to express the character of Jehovah of hosts? Of Him who had no beginning, and without whom nothing could have come into being, or have continued in existence a moment, unless he mediately or immediately upheld it? Do not the very terms of the description rather make it evident that some pre-eminent Creature is intended? Is it worthy of Paul, writing to the “believing brethren in Christ,” to tell them that the First Cause is before all things, and that by Him all things consist? But every doubt may be removed by considering the context. That declares who and what this Person is, and whose exceeding greatness is so much spoken of in the preceding verses. To this testimony it is proposed now to have recourse, since light can be found only with them who speak according to his word.

In verses 12, 13, the Apostle reminds the Colossians of the blessings that belong to the Church of God: such as the

advanced to a participation of this dignity, because it was “obedient unto death.” Wherefore God highly exalted it: and Jesus, about to ascend into glory, thus announced that exaltation, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.”

Father's grace in delivering from the power of darkness, and translating into the kingdom of his Son. Having said nothing here of the character of God's Son, but that he was his "dear Son," he proceeds to describe the nature and excellencies of his person, and the greatness of his operations, before the Church had a beginning on earth. In ver. 15—17, he pronounces him to be a Creature characterized by the highest endowments and distinctions. "Who is the image of the invisible God, the First-born of every creature: for by him were all things formed [*ἐκτισθῆ*] that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were formed [*ἐκτισθῆ*] by him and for him. And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." It will be necessary to enlarge upon some of these points, to shew in the strongest light the agreement of the Old with the New Testament, and the consistency that pervades the Sacred Volume upon a subject to which the Christian world has for many ages been so averse to listen.

"Who is the image of the invisible God." An image *εἰκων* is not the thing itself, but a "resemblance," a "likeness": according to the adage, *Simile non est Idem*, "Likeness is not Sameness." "As we have borne the image [*εἰκονα*, "likeness,"] of the earthly, we shall also bear the image [*εἰκονα*, "likeness,"] of the heavenly." "The law having a shadow, [*σκιαν*, "outline,"] of the good things to come, and not the very image, [*αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκονα*, "the very resemblance or likeness,"] of the things," &c.* God's dear

* A misunderstanding of this last text has confirmed, if not led the way to, an error of a very important nature with respect to the person of Jesus Christ. Notwithstanding *εἰκων* is pronounced to signify an "image, or resemblance, or likeness" of a thing, yet with a perverseness, for which nothing but an unhallowed bias to a sentiment interwoven with our earliest recollection can account, Christians, without almost an exception, determine that in this passage *εἰκων* "image" must mean the "essential or substantial form," i. e. the "very thing itself." *Εἰκων* is clearly put in opposition to *σκιαν*, a "shadow, outline, delineation."

Son therefore appears from these words to be a Creature, for the image or likeness of God cannot be God himself, but a Creature of the highest dignity and excellence. He stands in the place of God, he is as God, who for his sake seeth no

The nature of this opposition may be seen in contemplating the work of an artist. The "outline" represents his design. This is readily understood by any one who is acquainted with the subject intended to be depicted. But however accurate this sketch or outline may be, it is not the very resemblance or likeness of what he designs. That is effected by the addition and judicious disposition of light and shade, &c. And when the very resemblance or likeness of what is intended is thus brought out, still it is impossible that it can be pronounced to be the thing itself. The skill of the artist has given a body or substance to what was at first no more than an outline, and so far he has put us in possession of what the thing is in all its proportions, beauties, &c. that when the original shall appear we shall have no doubt of its being the very thing. Yet still it is no other than a form embodied artificially: it is no other than an illusive substance which takes the imagination captive by the powers of art. But to say a few words of Heb. x. 1, "The law having a shadow *only* of good things to come, and not the very image," *image*, resemblance, "of the things," &c. The law shadows were, the purification of the body by washing and sprinkling, the offering of beasts, &c. the temporal pardon or non-visitation here for offences committed, the access to worship God in the courts of the Tabernacle or Temple, and the possession of Canaan while Israel walked according to the holy, just and good commandment. To the believing Jews these were sufficiently descriptive of the good things to come. Yet they were not *autem in similitudine*, "The very image, resemblance, or likeness." However well adapted the washing or sprinkling of the bodies of the Israelites with water and blood was as a shadow, neither of them reached to the purification of the heart and conscience, and therefore could not be said to be the very resemblance of those good things. The beast offered in sacrifice, however its outpoured blood and agonizing death might shadow out, yet from its nature and character it could not be the very likeness of the great expiatory sacrifice offered in the person of God's dear Son in the flesh. The sense of pardon, with its attendant peace, obtained through the expiation made by the offering of beasts, however satisfactory to the sinner in his burdened state dreading present wrath for recent offences, yet it could not be the very resemblance of that redemption which pronounces a full salvation from wrath to come, from all sin. The access to the inward or outward court of God's house to worship him, would satisfy the comer thereto, that he was not an outcast here below: but it could not be said to be the very likeness of that access which the believer will enjoy in the Jerusalem that is above, where he will be made a pillar

perverseness in the Israel of God. In him the Church be- holds all that the Father's love and mercy has provided, for in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom, truth and faithful- ness. By one offering of his body he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. The sprinkling of his blood by faith gives them a sense of free and full pardon from all sin. Through him the believer has access to the Father to worship in Spirit and in truth. From his intercession all his people have a good hope firm unto the end, of enjoying pleasures for evermore in the heavenly Canaan.

"The first-born of every creature." It has been the object of the most able Biblical critics to make it appear, that these words like the foregoing, have a reference to Deity. They tell us that the term "First-born" signifies to be born "Heir and Lord of all things." "First-born from the dead," they also say, means to be born "First or Lord over the dead." But will this sense of the word *πρωτοτοκος*, setting aside the idea communicated by the word "Born" or "Be- gotten," alter the natural character or Essence of Him of whom this Heirship or Lordship is spoken? In Col. i. 15. the distinction is predicated of a Son who was the image, the

of his God, and will go no more out. The land of Canaan, that goodly land, abounding in all temporal blessings, which Israel had in possession as long as they transgressed not the law, though a shadow of the good things which Emmanuel's land had to bestow, could never be said to be the express image, the very resemblance of that heavenly country, of its unceasing blessings, and the eternal rest which is there provided for the people of God. The law could be at best but a representation, and in all its typical exhibitions, whether sacrifices, ceremonies, meats, drinks, feasts, or sabbath days, it was an imperfect representation of good things to come. The very likeness of the things is to be found only in the ever- lasting gospel of God's grace, which sets forth Jesus Christ as all in all. Every ordinance of the law was "a shadow *σκια*" only "of the good things to come," the Gospel was the very image or likeness of what the law drew in outline only; but the body *σωμα*, the sum and substance of every shadow and image, is Christ. He existed before them. He gave rise to them. They all relate to him, and have their accomplish- ment in him. "The Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

likeness of God, and therefore could not be God : who was the First-born of every creature, and as such could not be Deity. In Heb. i. 2, God is said to have spoken in these last days by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things. But how can the Son as God be said to be heir of all things? Is he not in possession of all things? Was it ever otherwise? Can the contingency of inheritance be spoken of him? But granting that First-born, Heir and Lord are synonymous terms, this sense instead of opposing, confirms the creatureship of God's dear Son. The title of First-born as Heir and Lord is in perfect harmony with the preceding verses, and establishes the consistency of the sacred volume in regard to Jesus Christ as a Man, and in relation to his Pre-existence. But the literal sense of "First-born of every creature" is equivalent to the title which Christ gives himself in another place, viz. "The Beginning of the creation of God:" and to what Paul says, "When he bringeth in the First-begotten into the world." As the parrallelism of these passages is obvious, and ἡ ἀρχὴ "the Beginning" cannot relate to Deity, so it is clear also that πρῶτοτοκος "the First-born" cannot. And it appears most evident that critics would have been spared their labour on this subject, if it had not been deemed necessary to make the latter part of the Verse agree with the former.

"For by him were all things created [formed] that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created [formed] by him and for him."

The force of the verb *κτίω*, rendered "create" has been so fully considered already (See Chap. I.) as to require but few words to shew how little relation it can have to Deity in the present case. If what has been said is sufficient to establish the point of the Son's Creature-character, the beginning of this verse referring immediately to him, determines the sense of *ἐκτίσθαι* to be "were formed," i. e. were made of pre-existent matter, and not produced into first being. A

creature can make or form things from matter already in existence, according to the power and skill given to him of God, but no creature can bring Being out of a state of Non-entity. This is the prerogative of the First Cause alone. But besides that *ἐκτισθῆναι* in connection with what precedes can mean no more than the work of formation, the reader is especially referred to Chap. I. where it is shewn that production of being from a state of non-entity, which is the commonly received meaning of *בָּרָא*, *κτίζω*, "Create," has no foundation whatever as to the matter of fact, or, if it were so, to the possibility of such a fact being recorded in any language for the information of man. The learned and unlearned have for many ages consented to surrender their understanding, in this and not a few other instances, to their teachers, who have enforced the opinions of their predecessors without investigating what foundation they rested upon, or searching whether these things were so.*

* The following may suffice for examples in which *κτίζω* and *κτίσις* are asserted to bear the sense of production of being from a state of non-entity, and they will shew how little reason there is for such an assertion.

Mark xiii. 19 "In those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation *κτίσεως*, which God created *ἐκτίσεν* unto this time," &c.

Whoever has read the remarks made in the beginning of this work with attention, is aware of the distinction of producing matter into first being, and of forming that matter after it has been brought into existence. Matter in its first state of being consisted of Atoms, and was therefore without form or organization, and consequently not united to any percipient principle that could partake of and communicate sensations either of pain or pleasure. Can the Evangelist then refer to that primæval condition, and say that affliction *θλίψις* "grievous affliction or distress" existed when nothing but unorganized or insensible matter was in being? This circumstance alone would to the reflecting mind be sufficient to induce a doubt, that "creation" and "created" cannot mean the production of matter into first being. The affliction of which Mark speaks, was to befall the sons of men as a just retribution for offences; and it is pronounced far to exceed any affliction that had befallen the human race since they first existed. But when God began to manifest his incommunicable power of producing Entity from a state of non-entity, Man, and of course human violation of God's law, could have no existence on

But the adversary, besides denying the sense of "Creation and "created" as given in these two Texts, will urge, that, as the act of bringing into existence is in the power of the First Cause alone, Jesus Christ God's dear Son, as a creature,

earth; and the First Cause could have no provocation to avenge himself on a gainsaying and perverse generation by inducing grievous affliction or distress. The beginning of Formation-Work in the instance of Adam and Eve, produced, as all their sons and daughters experience, grievous affliction. Shame and confusion of face, followed by the anticipation of death in all its dread variety of horrors, then took place. But however great this affliction, it was not to be compared with that which was to be the portion of the children of men, when the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet should be standing where it ought not. If it be objected that God is said to form all that was formed, *κτίζων τὰν κόσμον*, it may be replied, that it is not inconsistent with Jesus Christ being the Former: for "God formed [*κτίζων*] all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. iii. 9. The authority of this passage therefore in Mark gives no confirmation to the opinion, that because Jesus Christ is said in Col. i. 16, to perform the stupendous work intended by the word *κτίζων*, he is necessarily the First Cause, Jehovah of Hosts: but performing that work it follows, that he existed before the Mundane system, and all that is therein had their present harmonious form and order: and the words of the Apostle in Col. i. 16, instead of attributing the incommunicable power and prerogative of Deity to Jesus Christ, God's dear Son, describe only his high dignity as the First-born of every creature, to whom the Father had given this distinguishing honour and pre-eminence.

2 Pet. iii. 4. "Saying, where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as *they were* from the beginning of the Creation *κτίσεως*."

Unwilling as ungodly men and scoffers are to acknowledge that Jesus will come again to take vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not his gospel, yet the Jews who were contemporary with Peter and to whom he wrote this epistle, were not so ignorant of the first principles of all things as to assert, that when God brought into being the Atoms which were the rudiments of the Mundane system, he left them in this state. Their meaning was that God visited not for offences from the earliest period of the world's being formed, and made the habitation of man. They were willingly ignorant of his judgments on the antediluvian world: i. e. they would not acknowledge those judgments, lest they should be under the necessity of confessing their equity, as well as the certainty of his interposing his power and executing his vengeance in cutting them off also from the face of the earth. It was natural to refer to the beginning of that period, when the earth was capable

however highly exalted, could have no part even in the formation of that heavenly host which is known by the several names of "Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers," since their formation must have been co-incident with their production from a state of Non-entity. There might be some ground for such an objection if it were certain that these spiritual Intelligences named Angels, some of which fell from and others kept their first estate, were intended by "Thrones, &c." It was observed at the beginning of this discussion that Paul's design was to shew the superiority of Christ over angels, and that men learned in the Scriptures differed widely in opinion concerning the essential character of the angels of whom he spake. Is it certain that angels always mean spiritual Intelligences? Will the context authorize the assumption that such are intended in this place? The Apostle's assertion is, "By Him were all things formed that are in heaven and that are in earth." His general description of these things follows next, "Visible and invisible." In contemplating these things under the opposite characters thus given to them, attention must be paid to the effect produced on the intelligent beings to whom they were and are the objects of perception, &c. or the contrary. To God all things are open: to his creature man, if not to Angels, some things from necessity of their Essence are invisible. Matter in its first or Atomic condition is of this kind. And whether the Atoms were those that filled the open expanse without the earth, or which were in the cavity of the earth, or within its pores, they were formed by Jesus Christ. There is matter however which is invisible to us, though not now in its first or atomic state. We see through or by means of the Light, yet its

of bearing the human race, and when they first existed upon it; but it is not within the limits of probability, that men, speaking to a fact, should refer to a point of time, when the Chaotic state of the world would make that fact impossible. *κρίσις* therefore can have no relation to the production of being from a state of non-entity. (See Ch. VII. under 2 Pet. iii. 5—7).

particles are not the objects of our sight. We live, move and have our being through or by means of the Air, yet its particles though much grosser than those of the Light are likewise to us invisible. Now these Invisibles were formed by Jesus Christ. For in the beginning that which we call Air did not exist as Air; and that which is now Light was not in being as Light. The matter which takes both these conditions existed in the beginning in another condition, and was by Jesus Christ made to assume those states or conditions named by Moses, "Spirit, Light"; and when working the will of him that formed them, "Firmament, Heaven." "By [Him who was] the Beginning Aleim formed the heavens and the earth." Gen. i. 1. "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the hosts of them." Gen. ii. 1. "By the WORD of Jehovah were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." Ps. xxxiii. 6. "In the beginning was the WORD—all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." John i. 1—3. "God formed all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. iii. 9. "For by him were all things formed that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were formed by him, and for him." Col. i. 17. It is to the matter of that which in its varied and manifold operations is called the "Heavens" and its "Hosts," that the names of "Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers," are given.*

* Our translators do not appear to have given the full force of the original in this last text. The idiom of the Greek will allow the following version, and the argument of the Apostle requires it. The reader will observe that the translation of each word is given in the same order as it stands in the original. "Οτι εν αυτω, For by him *en auto* were formed *ta panta* all these things, [viz.] *ta* these things *en tois epanois* that are in the heavens, *kai ta* and these things *en tois hui* [that are] on [or] in the earth, *ta* these things *opanta* [that are] visible, *kai ta* and these things *akata* [that are] invisible, *hete thronoi* whether thrones, *hete kyriotetes* whether dominions, *hete archai* whether principalities, *hete exousiai* whether powers,

Some proof however will be required that "Thrones, &c." mean the heavens and the power thereof. Previous to the giving of this proof, and in the way of introduction, it ought to be observed, that the terms in which Paul has recorded

τα πάντα all these things *δι' αὐτοῦ* by him *καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ* and for him *ἐκτίσθη* were formed. *καὶ* So *αὐτὸς ὢν* he is *πρὸ πάντων* before all things, *καὶ τα πάντα* and all these things *ἐν αὐτῷ* by him *συνίστανται* consist."—The reasoning of the Apostle is this. God's dear Son, who when Incarnate redeemed by his blood, and therefore was exalted in the flesh to be a Prince, and a Saviour to give repentance and forgiveness of sins, has the high honour of being the image or likeness of the invisible God: he has also a pre-eminence above all creatures in being brought forth into open or manifest existence before them all. And as a proof of this he adds, it must needs be so, for by him were formed not all things, though that were true, but all these things, viz. These things that are in the heavens, and these things that are on the earth, these things that are visible, and these things that are invisible, whether called Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, Powers: even all these things, which are made Angels or spiritual Intelligences, and worshipped by the heathen, though devoid of all consciousness and intellectual capacity: all these things were formed by him and for him. So (See *καὶ* thus rendered in John xv. 8, Heb. iii. 19) he is manifestly before all things taken in an absolute sense, seeing that these material Angels or Agents were the first things which he formed, and by their agency all other things were brought into manifest being. And having thus formed all these things, visible and invisible, it is moreover evident, that all these things consist by him to this day, inasmuch as he upholdeth all things by the word of his power. With such perspicuity and philosophical accuracy the Apostle begins his argument in this chapter, to shew the superiority of God's dear Son over them that are called gods and lords: and in the next place warns the Colossians to beware lest any man should make a prey of them through an empty and deceitful philosophy, which would lead them to the worship of the material Agents that do involuntarily the will of him who formed them. Such doctrine and practice he declared to be founded only on the traditions of Men, and on the supposed character of pre-eminence and power which is attributed to the elements or rudiments of which the mundane system is composed, and not in conformity to the precepts of Christ; or to the practice of his disciples. As many as have employed themselves in making this scripture speak of Deity and his work of producing Being from a state of Non-entity, appear to have erred from an inversion of the order in which they ought to have exerted their talents. They first determined that "Thrones, &c." were celestial intelligent Agents, and that as nothing less than the power of Jehovah could bring them into being from non-existence; they then concluded that it

the mighty works of the Son of God, are most decisive of the fact that these "Thrones, &c." are the powers of the Air, and not intellectual Agents. The all things in heaven and in earth, described as partaking of an opposite character "visible" and "invisible," undergo a peculiar specification. But no allusion is made to greater or lesser lights in the firmament. No hint is given of grass, herb, tree, creeping thing, beast, or winged fowl. There is no mention of the greater or lesser congregation of waters with their different inhabitants. Yet all these things were made by God's dear Son. The reason is that they are all objects of human sight, and are none of them of such a character as to be invisible when present to man. The all things are limited to "Thrones, &c." with the emphatic repetition of the conjunction *εἴτε*. "All things that are in heaven and that are in earth, *εἴτε* whether Thrones, *εἴτε* whether Dominions, *εἴτε* whether Principalities, *εἴτε* whether Powers." And this limitation was expressly for the purpose of carrying on his argument, that Christ was superior to Angels. But what saith Scripture? We learn from different passages of the Old and New Testament that the "heaven" is called a "Throne." Is. lxvi. 1. Matt. v. 34. That the air is termed "Dominions, Principalities, Powers." Eph. ii. 2, compared with chap. i. 21—vi. 12. The heavens are also called in the Old Testament אֱלֹהִים, "Aleim." Ps. viii. 6—xcvi. 5—xcvii. 7. Where these Scriptures are quoted in the New Testament, אֱלֹהִים, "Aleim," is rendered by the word *αγγελου*, "Angels.*" This will explain Rom. viii. 38, where

must have been Jehovah Son who produced them. They ought on the contrary to have argued, that as there can be no word to express the act of bringing being into first existence, it could not follow that "Thrones, &c." must mean intelligent Agents in their state of first production into existence, and therefore of necessity be an act of the First Cause; but as they might mean pre-existent inert matter to which a new form was given, so their production in that form might be the act of a Creature.

* The older Hebrews called the Heavens sometimes אֱלֹהִים, sometimes מַלְאָכִים. The first in Greek is *θεος*, *Deus*, "God," the second *αγγελος*, *angelus* "angel." Ps. viii. 6, "Thou hast made him [בן אדם] "the Son of Man"] a little lower מַלְאָכִים than the Aleim. Heb. ii. 7, "Thou

the word "Angels" is added to "Principalities and Powers," and gives a clue to the easy reception by Christians of the perversion of the Jews on the subject of the intellectual angelic hosts being intended in Col. i. 16, and other similar texts. It is to the apostate Jews that we are indebted for the confusion that has prevailed on this subject, to the dismay of the fearful Christian, and to the triumph of them who deny the Holy and Just One. By banishing philosophy from the Old Testament Scriptures they laid the foundation of its rejection from the New. And though the glorious name of God's dear Son still remains on record, and the stupendous work of salvation is still written in such characters that he may run who readeth, yet the Redeemer's crown is despoiled of many of its brightest gems. Ignorance upon self-evident points has been the consequence, and many fundamental doctrines, of which the Pre-existence of the Man Jesus Christ is chief, when unfolded to the public view, have been regarded as no better than heretical pravities.

made him a little lower than *αγγελοι* the Angels." The ancient heathens called the various operations of the heavens "Aleim." The Greeks termed these Aleim, "Angels." And the ancient heathens and Greeks as well as the apostate Jews worshipped them. Indeed the Angels of the Greeks, viz. the powers of the celestial fluid, described in their operations, Ps. cxlviii. 8, "Fire, hail, snow, vapours, stormy winds," were unceasingly yet involuntarily and unconsciously working the will of their Lord and Ruler. Paul having noted that Christ had overcome and spoiled principalities and powers, casting down those strong holds of Satan and establishing his throne and dominion upon their ruins, warns the Colossians against serving them that were without power to save or destroy. "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility, and worshipping of Angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen." The later Jews have made the Cherubim, which are the emblems of the several operations or conditions of the matter of the heavens, Angels. They have represented them by figures in the likeness of men, and pretend that they were employed in presenting their prayers to Jehovah. The Romish Church has adopted and improved this spirit of perverseness, by making not only the Jewish celestial hierarchy, but deceased saints, to be angels, conferring on them the power of hearing the prayers of the living, and of making intercession for them.

1 Tim. i. 15. "This a faithful saying and worthy of all acception that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."

1 John iii. 5, 8. "And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins."

1 John iv. 9, 10. "In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son, to be the propitiation for our sins."

2 Tim. i. 8, 9, 10. "God, who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, but is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

Heb. x. 5. "Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me."

1 John iv. 2, 3. "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every Spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every Spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and that is the spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world."

2 John 7. "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an Antichrist."

Though sufficient has been said in confirmation of the doctrine of the Pre-existence of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son, Servant, and Prophet of Jehovah, yet the above texts are so pointedly to the subject, that a selection of the most prominent Scriptures on this topic would be defective if they were omitted. They are therefore offered to the reader's consideration with a few general remarks.

Jesus Christ who is the sum and substance, the beginning and ending of all the apostolical writings, is said by Paul to

come into the world for a purpose of the greatest love and mercy, even to save sinners by giving himself for them. John echoes these glad tidings, reminding his countrymen that they knew he was manifested for this purpose. Whether then we advert to the expression "come" or "manifested," there can be no doubt of his Pre-existence who came or was manifested. A non-existent cannot be said to come or be manifested. Both terms denote a prior state of being. Nor is there any difficulty in determining the person who having left another world appears in this. He is pronounced to be God's only Son, and to be sent of God to be a propitiation for our sins, that we might live through him. When this love of God the Father who sends, and the grace of his Son who comes in the flesh to lay down his life for us, is duly weighed, a distinction of Individual character in the Father and Son are most clear, as is the 'Creature-condition' of him who was manifested on Earth. The time when this grace was given to the members of Christ, and secured in him their glorious head, viz. before the world began, marks in the following quotation an earlier existence of both Christ and his Church than believers in the sacred volume are generally accustomed to contemplate: as the appearance of Jesus Christ in the flesh according to the prophecies, is also an undoubted manifestation of that grace to all the chosen objects. But the Pre-existence of the Saviour is peculiarly marked in the words of Paul to the Hebrews, where he alludes to Ps. xl. 6. "Wherefore when he cometh [*ερχομενος* "coming,"] into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me." The great and long expected event of Christ's coming into the world is always expressed in words which denote only his taking upon him an Outward frame. There is no mention made of that which is usually called the Soul, and is considered to be a part, and a part only, of the real man. That which is equivalent to the Soul must have existed in the person of Messiah before the Incarnation, or Christ, when he came into the world and took the body prepared for

him, would have had no soul, or in other words could not have been a Man. But this is no longer a disputed point. The Soul is known to be the Man. The body is the tabernacle only in which the Man sojourns for a while. "Therefore we are always confident, knowing, that whilst We are at home in the body, We are absent from the Lord." When therefore Christ came into the world which he had made, he speaks of himself as an Individuality distinct from his Father, pronounces his leaving another state of being, and manifesting himself in a body which the Father by his Spirit had prepared for him at the time appointed to empty himself of his pre-existent glory, and by obeying and suffering to fulfil all righteousness. That this is a doctrine from heaven, and therefore worthy of all acceptance, the beloved disciple John declares in terms which it will be difficult to evade, or to gainsay with success. From the earliest periods since the fall, a spirit of perverseness with respect to the revealed truths of God has been seen in all the Children of Adam. During the lives and preaching of the Apostles, little doubt can be entertained but that the Church was led by them into all truth upon every point of doctrine as well as practice. While the last of these lingered on earth waiting for his crown, ungodly men began to deny the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, as he was revealed by the Spirit. John therefore reminds his countrymen that the Spirit of Antichrist, which had been foretold, was then working among the Children of disobedience in denying the Pre-existent Redeemer and his Incarnation. "Every Spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God—For many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an Antichrist."

From the view which has been taken of numerous texts and the arguments usually founded upon them, it appears that the doctrine of the Pre-existence of the Man Jesus Christ is not in opposition to those Scriptures of the Old and New Tes-

tament which have been most generally supposed to impugn it. On the contrary its reception, when the arguments which have been advanced are duly appreciated, must be acknowledged to be attended with many advantages which should recommend it to such as are diligently searching after truth. It reflects much light upon very many portions of Holy Writ, which, according to the usual mode of interpretation are obscure and perplexing, if not contradictory to each other and to the general tenor of the word of God. It reconciles many passages, which the advocates for long established opinions acknowledge do not admit of a very ready explanation. It surprises with unexpected views of a striking propriety of expression in texts where nothing peculiar had been before observed or suspected; and it leads to the discovery of beauties which had been lost by the misapprehension if not perversion of almost every commentator. It is not derogatory to the honour of Jehovah Aleim, for it does not obscure one beam of his incommunicable glory, nor set aside one jot or tittle of his Covenant work. It exalts in a way not even contemplated, according to the sentiments of the Church of God for many past ages, the personal excellency of his Son, the one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, without infringing in the least upon the honour or adoration due to his Father and his God. It adds a new lustre to the atonement of the Lord's Christ: for the more highly exalted his personal character and dignity, the more meet he must be to undertake that wonderful work, and the more able to accomplish it. It magnifies his self-denial and humility in voluntarily undertaking to empty himself of the glory he had with the Father before the world began, and to take a fleshly tabernacle like unto his brethren, that he might be tempted in all points, like as they are, and be numbered with the transgressors, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death.

“Conceive of this glorious Being, the only begotten Son of God, vested with such dignity before the creation of the

world, adored by angels, appearing in the form of God, governing the nation of Israel, the Church of God in former ages! Behold this holy, this happy Being, descending from heaven to take upon him, not flesh only, but the likeness of sinful flesh: uniting himself to animal nature in mean and despicable circumstances, really and sensibly feeling the hardships of pressing poverty and a low estate! See the illustrious Being who had been surrounded with ministering angels for many ages, the highest of every created power, brought forth in a stable, and laid in a manger! Behold him now enduring all the feeble and innocent frailties of an infant state, wearing the years of childhood among the poor and necessitous children in the lower ranks of life, the reputed son of a carpenter, subject to his earthly parents, spending thirty years in mean obscurity! Consider this ancient ornament of heaven, the brightest created Spirit there, the delight of God, who rejoiced in his presence before the earth was made, he who had lived four thousand years in the midst of divine splendors, attended by the chariots of God and the legions of angels at Sinai, when in tremendous majesty he delivered the law! Trace him now [in the flesh] wandering through the villages, hungry, thirsty, weary: travelling on foot to preach the gospel; attended with poor fishermen, abused, reproached, and called a blasphemer, a devil; arraigned at an impious tribunal, and condemned to the shameful cross as a scandalous malefactor! See the ancient, original king of Israel, who had David, Solomon, and all their race as his deputies, now crowned [in the body of his flesh] with thorns instead of glory; the fairest image of God, scourged, buffeted, nailed to the cursed tree between two thieves, his hands and feet pierced, groaning, expiring! Behold Him in the dreadful hour of darkness, assaulted by the armies of hell with horrid temptations, the sport of the Jewish rabble, a sacrifice to the fury of men, and the arrows of divine justice, his [animal] soul exceeding sorrowful even unto death, the sword of Jehovah awakened against the Shepherd of Israel, the man that was

his neighbour! Collect the astonishing ideas together, survey them in one view, and who can help crying out, O how divinely glorious was the love of God in parting with such a Son from his bosom! How amazing was the condescension and self-denial of the glorious Saviour in giving himself for us sinners! How matchless his holy submission to his father's will, his zeal for his father's glory, and his love and compassion to rebellious men! How astonishing when we consider him holy and happy, in the exalted state of glory, foreknowing and surveying all these humbling circumstances, indignities, agonies, and deaths, and yet cheerfully resolving to assume flesh, and endure all for the redemption of sinners, because it was the will of God! To what an inconceivable height of sacred amazement doth this raise all the wonders of his painful life and powerful love! It is a love that hath lengths and breadths, heights and depths! It is a love that passeth knowledge!!!”

APPENDIX.



ΕΙΣ ΤΡΙΑ.

OR

JEHOVAH

IN A

TRINE-PLURALITY.

ΕΙΣ ΤΡΙΑ.

OR

JEHOVAH IN A TRINE-PLURALITY.

THE word Heretic, in its general signification, denotes a person who, either directly or indirectly, has been the occasion of exciting divisions and dissensions in the Christian Church, by the introduction of opinions concerning Jehovah and his Messiah contrary to those which are commonly received. Among the eminent characters which have promoted the diffusion of the religion of Christ, from the time of the Apostles to the present day, there are therefore few who, in the esteem of their cotemporaries or successors, have not in some part of their life and doctrine incurred the imputation of Heresy. This however has not deterred men in every age from inquiring after what is Truth, and where it is to be discovered. Their number indeed has not been very great. For man, whether he be considered in relation to his prospects in this life, or the next, employs his talents rather in defending the principles on which he has been taught to rest his hopes, than in investigating those which he is confident would, if they proved to be founded in truth, dissolve the whole fabric which he is raising. It is not to be expected that men will seek very diligently after that which they would be sorry to find: viz. the total discomfiture of their educational prejudices.

The method of teaching the doctrines of Christianity in the first century was most simple. All the subtil rules of philosophy, and all the precepts of human art were rejected. This is abundantly proved by the writings of the Apostles and others of that period which have survived the ravages of time. In no part of Scripture is there found any allusion to a controversy grounded on the doctrine of the Trinity, or any intimation that an ignorance or rejection of this Truth, for a truth it is, and a truth on which the believer may rest with a firm hope to the end of his mortal course, is fatal to acceptance with God. It was "a doctrine which in the first three centuries happily escaped the vain curiosity of human research, and was left undefined and undetermined by any particular set of human ideas. Nothing was dictated to the faith of Christians in this matter, nor were there any modes of expression prescribed as requisite to be used in speaking of this mystery. Hence it happened that the Christian doctors entertained different sentiments upon this subject without giving the least offence, and discoursed variously concerning the distinctions between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, each following his respective opinion with the utmost liberty."

While a similar freedom is now exercised amongst us by consent of the legislature, it is to be lamented that men, who entertain different sentiments upon this subject, instead of agreeing to receive what is advanced by each other with that spirit of urbanity which marks their conduct in other matters, are too prompt to impute to each other a design of subverting the fundamental principles of the Christian faith. All men have not the same talents and advantages. It is not therefore to be expected that all should see every truth in the same light. Let it be granted that the Sacred Volume speaks of man as a fallen creature, to be recovered only by the power of God, through the expiation made by the Son of God manifested in the flesh, of which work of mercy none can have any knowledge but by the teaching of the Spirit, and

the right hand of fellowship may and ought to be cordially given and received. If in explaining these topics any opposition should occur to opinions which each esteems to be orthodox, Christian charity demands of both parties not hastily to determine, that he whom he makes an adversary for a word must be a promoter of damnable heresies, because he holds a diversity of sentiment. Paul anathematized him who loved not the Lord Jesus Christ: but he ought not to be disowned as a Christian and anathematized, who believes Jesus to be the Christ, and acknowledges him as head and Lord of the Church, appointed of the Father through the anointing of the Holy Spirit.

There are things which the eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, which God has revealed unto him by his Spirit. They are called the deep things of God. The humble inquirer into these things is therefore encouraged to proceed, not only because there is a revelation, but also on account of the singularly expressive terms in which that revelation is made known. "The invisible things of Him," says Paul, "from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." Whoever is anxious to learn what God has said on these things, is not left to mere conjecture on any point of his researches. Certainty presents itself at every turn. Though the things of God which he would investigate escape the keenest powers of his senses when best exercised, they are nevertheless capable of being clearly seen, and fully understood. And this has been the case from the creation of the world. No generation of man has been without this high privilege, and it will be withdrawn in no future age. Spiritual blessings, not excepting the knowledge of the Father of Spirits in his way and work of Redemption, have been, and will ever be granted to them that are preserved in Christ Jesus, who are the called according to his purpose, in that measure and manner which shall be most expedient for their progress in the divine life. But there is a path to which the

inquirer must confine himself: a path which is as clearly prescribed as it is adapted to his powers and his habits. He must not wander into regions untried and unknown, because the object of his researches is afar off: for the invisible things of God have ever since (*απο*) the creation of the world been clearly seen of men, being understood or explained to his his understanding (*νοημενα*) by the things that are made.

Unhappily very different expedients have been resorted to, to unfold what has been revealed of Jehovah in his ways to the sons of men, both by them who feared God and worked righteousness, and by them who had the form of godliness without its power. Instead of having recourse to the works of God in the heaven above, and the earth beneath, and the waters under the earth, for a right understanding of what He is to man in the plan of Redemption, they have turned their inquiries into another channel. They have overlooked the obvious truth that none of Jehovah's works can shadow forth his Essence, for that is unsearchable: and they have disregarded that plain matter of fact, that the invisible things, i. e. the spiritual works of Jehovah, are manifested to the understanding of man by things that are made, even those glorious creatures by which we live and move, and through which we have our temporal being.

The words of the Apostle Paul lead us to this conclusion, that the things of God which are not the objects of our outward senses, have each had a counterpart in the natural world since the creation, and that this counterpart not only accurately agrees with and illustrates their spiritual character, but was designed by God for that purpose. This is generally acknowledged to a certain extent. But there are few who do not express great alarm when the sentiment is applied to the doctrine of the Trinity. Whence does this opposition arise? Chiefly, if not entirely, from an ignorance of the terms employed. The doctrine of the Trinity is called with propriety a Mystery. But are men agreed on the meaning of the word Mystery? Has it not been as much the subject

of superstitious reverence with the Trinitarian, causing him to remove and stand afar off, instead of drawing nigh to examine into what is commanded to be received, as it has been of ridicule to the Socinian, who scoffingly declares that where Mystery begins there Religion ends.* Considering a mystery not as something absolutely unintelligible and incomprehensible, but as a divine truth proposed under and represented by symbols, signs and outward figures, or as a divine secret to be known of man only by a revelation from God, the doctrine of the Trinity is properly a Mystery. It contains a spiritual truth under a veil. Revelation is the unveiling, throwing back the veil, (revelare) or disclosing the thing hidden, or bringing the spiritual truth to light. What is brought to the Christian's view by unveiling the things hidden in the doctrine of the Trinity, will be the subject of the succeeding pages.

1. The *Matter* or substance *which fills the mundane system* every where, where no other matter is, has no name or word to express it in the Hebrew Scriptures. Therefore its Essence is not described. There are however names of its *Three Conditions* or *Operations*. These are חמה, שמש, בעל, as they respect the Sun: and אש, אור, רוח as they respect the Earth.

2. חמה. The *Matter* or substance *which fills the mundane system* every where, where no other matter is, in that condi-

* Leigh, in his Greek Critica Sacra, defines Mystery, (μυστήριον) "A divine truth proposed under and represented by symbols, signs and outward figures." In the margin he adds, "It can hardly be doubted that the origin of the word is Hebrew. סתר is to *hide, conceal*; מסתור, *a thing hidden, concealed, secret*." Parkhurst says, it denotes "A spiritual truth couched under an external representation or similitude, and concealed or hidden thereby, unless some explanation be given." He adds "A most unscriptural and dangerous sense is too often put upon this word, as if it meant something absolutely unintelligible and incomprehensible. In almost every text where μυστήριον is used, it is mentioned as something which is revealed, declared, shewn, spoken, or which may be known or understood." Suicer says, that "It is a concealed thing or divine secret, which by nature is unknown to human reason, and can be discovered only by a Revelation from God."

tion which is called *Solar Fire*. It is not the Solar Orb; which is **חַרְס**. It is called Father **אב** by the heathen. For Fire is that by which all things are procreated or generated. It is derived from **חם** to be *hot*.

3. **שמש**. The *Matter* or substance *which fills the mundane system* every where, where no other Matter is, in that Condition which is called *Solar Light*. It irradiates directly from the Sun, and continues its course until it reaches the several orbs, or the boundary of the mundane system. It builds up (**בן**) all that **חמה** the Solar Fire brings into manifest existence; makes them to increase, grow up, vegetate, &c. It is **מלך** *king*, or Ruler by day: and is derived from **שמש** to *minister*.

4. **בעל**. The *Matter* or substance *which fills the mundane system* every where, where no other matter is, in that Condition in which it returns to the Sun through the advancing Solar Light **שמש**, and until it has reached that Orb. It is called *Spirit*. It takes or has possession (**בעל**) by night, and so rules or directs in the place of **שמש** Solar Light; and is distinguished from **שמש** the ruling power by day: 2 Kings xxiii. 5. It is derived from **בעל**, to *have* or *take possession of*, or have *authority over*.

5. $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{חמה} \\ \text{שמש} \\ \text{בעל} \end{array} \right\} \text{ is termed } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{אש} \\ \text{אור} \\ \text{רוח} \end{array} \right\} \text{ when acting on}$
the Earth and the other secondary Orbs.

6. **אש**. The *Matter* or substance *which fills the mundane system* every where, where no other matter is, in that Condition when it is in its most active or violent motion on the Earth and the secondary Orbs. It is called *Fire*, and is derived from **אש**, to be *vehemently moved*.

7. **אור**. The *Matter* or substance *which fills the mundane system* every where, where no other matter is, in that Condition when it is in a less active or violent motion on the Earth and the other secondary Orbs, than when it is termed **אש** Fire. It is called *Light*, and is derived from **אור**, to *flow*.

8. רוח. The *Matter* or substance *which fills the mundane system* every where, where no other matter is, in that Condition when it is in a still less active motion on the Earth and the other secondary Orbs, than that which is termed אור Light. It is called *Spirit*, and is derived from רח, to move gently as in breathing.

9. חשך. A term expressive of the state of the *Matter* or substance *which fills the mundane system* every where, where no other matter is, when brought into being, and before motion was given to it. It denotes it to be *Inoperative*, but says nothing of its Essence, or what it is. It is called *Darkness*,* and is derived from חשך, to stop.†

* There are several words in the Hebrew language which express what we mean in general by "Darkness," but none of which have any relation to חשך in its radical sense.

עב. "The gross condensed part of the *Matter* or substance, &c. toward or near the extremity of the mundane system."

עלטה. "The dusk of the evening when the Light is become gross or thickened." From עלט to be *gross, thick*.

אפל. "Thick darkness." From אפל, to *hide, conceal*, by interposing some opaque matter. It expresses an effect greater than חשך. This denotes the Inactivity of concreted atoms: that a stronger and closer concretion of atoms, but not devoid of motion in that concreted form. Hence in composition, ערפל, "Thick darkness," or the *Matter* or substance, &c. in a gross state flowing down or back from the extremity of the mundane system.

קפאון. "Darkness." The *Matter* or substance, &c. condensed or coagulated, but moving as Spirit, and congealing other bodies. From קפא, to be *condensed, compacted, coagulated, congealed*.

קדורו. "Darkness." From קדר, to be *black, dark*.

† חשך. That state or condition in which the *Matter* or substance *which fills the mundane system* every where, where no other matter is, when brought into being. It is a state of *perfect rest*.

רוח. That state or condition in which the *Matter* or substance, &c. was when it was *first put in motion*, and in which condition it penetrates partially into most substances.

אור. That state or condition in which the *Matter* or substance, &c. was when *put into more rapid motion* than רוח, and in which condition it passes through all substances.

שט. That state or condition in which the *Matter* or substance, &c. was when *put into the most active motion*. It separates the parts of

10. שמים. A term explanatory of the general state of the *Matter* or substance, &c. when it ceased to be in that state in which it was when brought into being, and when it began to act in its threefold condition of Fire, Light, and Spirit. It denotes it to be *Operative*. From שם to *place, set, put* generally in order. It is called *Heavens*. In this state it has Three terms by which it is known, viz. רוח, אור, אש, *Spirit, Light, Fire*, denoting its Threefold Operation on the Earth and the other secondary orbs; for there and there only it is שמים, or that which *places or disposes in several ways*.

11. אש, אור, רוח, *Fire, Light, Spirit*, are not in or of the *Matter* or substance, &c. as denoting its *Essence*. They with חשך and שמים refer only to its *different states or conditions*, and therefore are not nouns substantives, the names of substances, but participial adjectives,* setting forth several con-

the substances on which it acts; apparently destroying, but in reality only volatilizing some of the heterogeneous particles held in union with them, and reducing the remainder to a calx.

* רוח and אור have clearly the participial form, and it is no objection to אש that it is without the ו, as it is frequently omitted in the participle Benoni in Kal. e. g. בר "that which is pure," or if it must be considered as a noun "Purity," it can be no more than the name of a quality. The proper rendering therefore of רוח, אור, אש, is not by the nouns "Spirit, Light, Fire," as the names of substances, but by the paraphrase which the participial adjective requires, viz. "that which is gently moving"—"that which flows"—"that which moves vehemently." Or if they must be taken as nouns, they can be no more than the names of a quality, or of an action, or of a state, considered abstractedly, i. e. "A Breathing"—"A Flowing"—"A vehement Moving." In this case all is virtually granted, (that is required,) for there is no multiplication of substances, but of the states or conditions of *One* and the *Same* substance. The error appears to have taken its rise from the circumstances of no name having been given in Scriptures to the *Matter* or substance whose state or conditions are expressed by רוח, אור, אש. Each of them has been therefore pronounced to be a name of substance; and that which is One in nature, has been multiplied into three Agents or Substances because it acts in a Trine-Plurality of operations. The prescription of Centuries has led mankind to adopt a different view and different language on the subject to what is here stated. But though many and high precedents may be pleaded, they can never sanction what is erroneous. Error in proportion to its duration usually fixes itself

ditions of *One* and the *Same* thing: i. e. that which was in the state or condition of *דושך Inoperation*, is known as *אש*, *אור*, *רוח*, that which has Three several modes or degrees of operation, when in action or become *שמים*: Or the *Matter* or substance, &c. when it changes its state of *דושך Inaction*, has no other modes of operation than those denominated *רוח*, *אור*, *אש*, which in their united action, or the general expansion occasioned by their action termed *רקיע*,* are called *שמים Heavens*. Of the Essence of the *Matter* or substance, &c. nothing is said: the Scriptures inform us only that, whatever its Essence is, that Essence was at first *Inoperative דושך*, and that when it was put in motion it became in succession *רוח* "Spirit," Gen. i. 2. *אור* "Light," ver. 3. *אש* "Fire," ver. 16. In other words the *Matter* or substance in these Three Conditions is termed *שמים*, or that which arranges all things in the mundane system in their several places. No Thing is, in respect to its form, but what, and as, it is made by this *Matter* in its threefold operations. It was in this threefold character the object of worship by the heathen who knew not Jehovah, and was termed *אלהים* "Aleim" by them who served it.

12. *שמים*. The *Matter* or Substance, &c. in *Three Operations* called *Heavens*, is the type of the First Cause in his spiritual operations to the Sons of God become the Children of men. The name which he has given to himself in or under Three Operations, viz. *אלהים* "Aleim," is by the heathen given to the Three Operations of the *Matter* or substance,

more or less firmly in the mind of man. The prejudices of education are not likely to yield at once to the assertions of a few individuals, though consistency of Scriptural interpretation may plead strongly on their behalf. This ought not however to deter, or cause any who know the truth, to abstain from the promulgation of it.

* *רקיע*. The *Matter* or substance, &c. in a state of expansion, the atoms of Light pressing outward, and the conereted grains of Spirit pressing inwards. It is called *Firmament*. From *רקע* which signifies *motion of different parts of the same thing, at the same time, one part the one way, and the other the other way with force*.

&c. The ideas of the operations, characters, or offices of the First Cause as Aleim, are therefore to be taken from the operations, characters, or offices of the *Matter* or substance, &c. as שמים "Heavens," the אלהים "Aleim" of the Gentiles.

13. The *Matter* or Substance, &c. might have continued what it was when brought into being, חשך *Inoperative*, for ever; and so רוח, אור, אש, or its Three Operations would never have been known to the mundane system.

14. *Jehovah*, a term expressive of the state, character, or condition in which the First Cause was before he sent forth to action. It denotes that *He is*, but in no respect describes *what he is* or *does*.

15. *Aleim*, a term expressive of the states, characters, or relations in which the First Cause was when he acted in or with respect to the Mundane System. It denotes that he is *Operative*. His operations are described by the terms *Father*, *Son*, *Spirit*.*

* אלהים "*Aleim*," rendered "God" when in connection with יהוה "*Jehovah*," expressed or understood, and "Gods" when it refers to the object of heathen worship, as every word in Hebrew, has its peculiar meaning, and that drawn from the primary sense of its root. It has nothing to do with any degree of dignity. It means what Jehovah is to his people, Ps. iii. 8. what the Heavens are to all creatures, Ps. viii. 3, 5, and what Men in Authority ought to be to them that are subject to them, Ps. lxxxii. 6, 7.—the radical sense in each place being necessarily the same. But it will be asked, what is the Radical sense? What means are there of ascertaining it? Do the remains of the Hebrew literature furnish us with them? From the extraordinary circumstance of there being but One Book existing in the Hebrew tongue, and wonderful it is, that, after so extended a dominion as the Hebrews had, and the consequent wide diffusion of their language, One only should remain, the primary signification of many of the Roots are unknown. אלה, from which אלהים is derived, is one of them. It is found in the sense of "To swear, adjure, announce a curse": but it does not follow that this is its primary signification. Whatever it is, the doctrine or instruction conveyed in the word אלהים must have been generally and familiarly known under the Old Testament dispensation, or it could not have been an object of faith. It is now lost to both Jew and Gentile. Jehovah Aleim alone can restore the knowledge, which he has been pleased to withhold so long from a benighted world. The Jewish Church, which

16. *Father, Son, Spirit*, are not in or of the *First Cause*, as denoting his Essence. These terms, with those of *Jah* and *Jehovah*,* refer only to the different states, characters, or relations, in which he is revealed to his creature man in the work of redemption. For in respect to his Essence no revelation can be made, nor is man capable of receiving it if it could. The First Cause, who was in the state of *Inoperation*, at least as far as the mundane system was concerned, simply existing, as *Jah* or *Jehovah* express, without any office, character, or relation, which, little as we can comprehend it, must have been altogether the case before he went forth to action in the beginning of all his works, is made known in New Testament language as *Father, Son, Spirit*, when *Operative*. These are

retained it some time after the Ascension, and maliciously conspired to hide it from Christians, may perhaps be made the honoured instruments of its recovery, as they were at first commissioned to preach it to the Gentile world. This however is certain : when Jehovah shall give the Word, great shall be the company of them that publish it.

* *Jah* יה and *Jehovah* יהוה have a nearly common origin in sense as their roots יה and הוה prove. Both of which signify "To be" with some little variation in respect to the manner of being: but neither יה *Jah* nor יהוה *Jehovah* describes the Essence of the First Cause, as there is something more necessary than mere Being, however pre-eminent that being may be, to be conveyed in a name that sets forth the infinite perfection which is in his Essence. יה *Jah* and יהוה *Jehovah*, as names of the First Cause, do no more than say that *He is*, not *what He is*. In fact every language must be inadequate to this, since every language, not excepting the Hebrew, the most expressive and perfect of all, does no more than exhibit the objects, or the actions of those objects on which our senses are exercised, that from them we may obtain the ideas which we are now capable of receiving. And as No Things which we are able to contemplate with our senses can carry us beyond the mundane system, no word derived from them can lead us to a knowledge of that in which the Essence of *Jah* or *Jehovah* consists.

For—

If *Jah* and *Jehovah* are words descriptive of the Essence of the First Cause, then we are taught what the Essence of the First Cause is. But

It is impossible for a finite being to be taught what the Essence of the First Cause is. Ergo

Jah and *Jehovah* are not words descriptive of the Essence of the First Cause.

the only modes of his operations which are revealed, though in which ever office, character, or relation he acts, there he exists in all the fulness of his Essence. Or in other words, there is not a Trine-Plurality, as far as Scripture has revealed it, in the First Cause in respect to his Essence, but he has manifested himself in a Trine-Plurality of Operations in this our system, perhaps from its beginning, and certainly from the time of the Fall. His Essence * is no where spoken of directly or indirectly. Nothing can be said on the subject, because language has no terms to express what it is.† The Old Testament Scriptures speak of him as Aleim, and the New Testament as Father, Son, Spirit.

17. The *First Cause* might have continued *Inoperative*, or have given existence to no creature in this system, and in that case his office-characters or conditions of Father, Son, Spirit, would not have been. Or in other words, if the First Cause had continued Jah or Jehovah, i. e. simply existing, and consequently *Inoperative*, he could not have been known as Aleim. Jah or Jehovah express Being. Aleim denotes Operation. When the First Cause styles himself Jah or Jehovah, he informs us that he exists. When Aleim, that he acts.

18. *Jehovah Aleim*, or *He who is and worketh* hitherto for the redemption of his people, is virtually set forth in the Old Testament under that which the heathens called and made

* Nothing is more obvious to the informed and reflecting mind than the incapacity of any language to afford suitable words when Jehovah is the subject of discussion. It is usual in speaking of What He is, though it is impossible to say What He is, to term it his *Nature* or *Essence*. The former is more frequently used than the latter, though if its derivation be considered it is altogether improper. *To esse* "To be" may be predicated of Him who is without beginning and without end: but *To nasci* "To be born" cannot.

† When men attempt to speak of Jehovah it is negatively. They can do no more than remove from him whatever implies imperfection. They therefore say, He is without beginning, without end, without body, parts or passions, infinite, invisible, impassible, immortal.

Aleim, viz. the שמים or the *Matter* or Substance, &c. in motion, the well known object of their worship. The conditions of this matter are Three, רוח, אור, אש, Spirit, Light, Fire, and they answer to the Three names of רוח, אב, בן, or πνευμα, υιος, πατηρ, *Spirit, Son, Father*, of the New Testament. Nor were these names of the New Testament unknown to the Jews. They were aware of the use which Christians would make of them, and therefore concealed the knowledge which their fathers had.* And Christians when they became possessed of the fact agreed to bury it in silence from a fear of being under the necessity of reverting to the emblematic † way of interpreting Scripture. For the terms Father, Son,

* Jehovah is expounded by the Jews by twelve Letters. אב Raym. Martin, Pugio Fidei, fol. 544. And by forty-two Letters, אב אל בן אל רוח הקדש אל אן איכם שלשה אלהים כי אם אל אחד, Pugeo Fidei, fol. 545. The forty-two lettered name according to R. Hakadosh is אלהים בן אלהים רוח הקדש אחד אחד בשלשה אב. Apud Kircher Œdip. Egypt. tom. ij. p. 246.

† The *Hieroglyphic* or *Emblematic* way in which the Scriptures are and could only be written, and which mode of preserving knowledge remained in the possession of the heathen world, has been long rejected by the Church of Christ as a legitimate method of instruction. A revival of this way alone can lead to the intimate sense of the Scriptures, and it will be found the surest means of unfolding those beauties which captivate the mind, while they shed an additional lustre on the glories of Revelation. The want of this has prevented the Bible from appearing to be what it is, the most sublime and interesting description which has been or can be written of the most sublime and interesting subjects. The want of this has involved the understanding of those who love the Truth in inextricable mazes of contradictions and absurdities, and secured the retreat of Deists, Arians and Socinians, whenever opposed by Scripture, in fastnesses from which it is in vain to attempt to dislodge them. If the information to be derived from the New Testament terms Father, Son, Holy Spirit, when sought for in the Old Testament Hieroglyphics of אש, אור, רוח, which the heathen made and called their Aleim, had been duly appreciated, the doctrine of the *Eternal Generation* of the Son would have been unknown, and Jehovah Aleim of both Testaments would have stood confessed. And though preverse minds would not have been wanting to impugn the Truth as it is in Jesus, yet His Church would have been spared the mortification of witnessing the triumph which the adversary now enjoys.

Spirit, of the New Testament, can be made intelligible only by shewing their correspondence with אש, אור, רוח, Fire, Light, Spirit, the שמים, or Three Conditions of the *Matter* or Substance which fills the mundane system every where, where no other matter is.

19. The object of the Heathen worship was the *Heavens* שמים, or the *Matter* or substance which fills the mundane system every where, where no other Matter is in its *Three* conditions of *Fire, Light, Spirit*. The earliest of the Heathen shew that this *Matter* before it was put in action was a Unity in the state of דושך or "perfect rest," and that in its first state of action it was רוח "Spirit," in its second אור "Light," and in its third אש "Fire." Thus they had a notion of *Three* consistent with a Unity in their Deity. But the Triplicity was in action, and the Unity in Essence. And moreover as the Three whom they worshipped אש, אור, רוח, Fire, Light, Spirit, were in all earthly things, to which alone their thoughts were directed, what the terms אב, בן, רוח, Father, Son, Spirit, signified; when the Apostles were directed to initiate the heathen nations into the name of Father, Son, Spirit, they brought nothing new in the letter to them, and nothing inconsistent in the Spirit with what their forefathers had known and held to be true. When the Principia were understood, no violence was offered to the terms of their original Creed. They were only called to serve the Creator instead of the Creature, to turn from vanities and a lie to the true and living Aleim.

20. *Jehovah* manifests Himself as one in Aleim, in his character of אש *Fire*, when he executes judgment on criminals. And such he was to his Son, the first-born among many brethren, Jesus, when, being sent into the world, he became the substitute of sinners.

Jehovah manifests himself as *One* other Aleim, in his character of אור *Light*, when he Covenanted with his Son Jesus before the world was, and when in the fulness of the time he sent him into the world, to take the Law place of sinners.

To him Jehovah was אש דת Deut. xxxiii. 2, the *Fire*, the *Law*, or *Wrath*. To them who receive the Son he is אור *Light* or *life*, giving them the privilege to become the Children of *Light*.

Jehovah manifests himself as one other in *Aleim*, in the Character of רוח *Spirit*, when having as אש *Fire* poured all the vials of his wrath on Jesus, he comforts the world, for whom he sent his Son to become a sacrifice for sin, with the full assurance of hope: begetting them again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. Thus the fear of *Fire* or *Wrath* departs, *Light* or *Life* springs up, and the *Breath* of *Life* comes into them that were dead in sin, and they stand up an exceeding great army. These he *inspires* continually with a good hope, through grace, that the Covenant of his peace who hath mercy on them is sure, and shall never be removed.

21. What *Jehovah* was and revealed himself to be as *Aleim* to the *Souls* or *Inward Man* of his election according to grace, that he set up the Heavens or the *Matter* or Substance which fills the mundane system every where, where no other *Matter* is, to be to their *Bodies* or *Outward Man*. This *Matter*, &c.* in its various operations was called by the heathen, who knew not *Jehovah*, *Aleim*, and was worshipped instead of *Jehovah Aleim*. They saw this their *Aleim* to be the cause of "generating," "building up," and "preserving" their *Bodies* and renewing all things around them, and made that alone all their desire which administered all that they

* To this *Jehovah Aleim* gave the appellation of שמים when in operation and appointed it to be ruler under him in the mundane system, to place, dispose, or arrange the component parts of the gross *Matter* of which all things consist. *Jehovah* made the *Matter* or substance which fills the mundane system every where, where no other *Matter* is, when שמים or in action, a representative of himself as *Aleim*. This mechanically acts upon and governs all *Matter* in the natural, as *Jehovah Aleim* does all things in the spiritual world. And each of its states, conditions, or offices, performs that to the material system which *Jehovah* in the corresponding office or character as *Aleim* does to the spiritual.

concerning the **Mystery of the Trine-Plurality**? It will be granted that the Old Testament is not contrary to the New, and while none will contend that the tongue in which the New Testament is written is the language of nature or accurately represents the works of nature, *i. e.* Jehovah's Formation-work, which the Hebrew tongue in which the Old Testament is written does, it will follow that to understand rightly what is intended by the terms, Father, Son, and Spirit, we must have recourse to the Hebrew Scriptures. And as the Hebrew language is founded upon natural ideas or those derived from Formation-work, and the Hebrew Scriptures transfer those ideas to spiritual objects, we can look to them only for what Jehovah has revealed of the spiritual sense, that is to be deduced from those New Testament terms which express his Trine-Plurality.

24. It has been objected to the advocates of the doctrine of the *Trinity*, that they require it to be revered as a *Mystery* treating of the Essence of Jehovah, which being necessarily incomprehensible, it must be presumptuous to look into it: and that they assert it to be revealed only for the trial and exercise of our faith; which the more implicit it is the more it honours Him who has proposed the *Mystery* to us.*

* Is the doctrine of the Trinity, or a Trine-Plurality in Jehovah, an abstract speculation, not intended for the exercise of our understandings, but designed for an object of mere implicit Faith? Or is it a plain revelation, to which the concurrence of reason, when under a right direction, is required, and is it designed to manifest the wisdom as well as the love of Jehovah to man?

In reply it may be observed, First, that Conviction cannot be expected without Evidence, and that Conviction can go no further than Evidence has gone before. Or, in other words, we must have a right understanding of that of which we are convinced. So far, it may be said, that we believe, because so far we understand. But where there is no Evidence, we can have no Conviction: or where we do not understand we can have no Faith.

Secondly, it may be said that,

What is revealed cannot be beyond all created Capacity to understand:

But

The doctrine of a Trine-Plurality in Jehovah is revealed: Ergo

This opprobrium however can be directed to them alone who make the term *Mystery* to mean something unintelligible and incomprehensible, and who contend that the *Essence* of *Jehovah* is set forth in the terms which declare Him to be revealed to his Church in a *Trine-Plurality*.

25. In determining our *Faith* in the *Trinity*, we must know the terms to which we are to assent, and that these terms imply no contradiction to the knowledge we have obtained from the Scriptures rightly understood. If the terms are explained in such a way as to oppose our natural ideas, *i.e.* the ideas we derive from nature, or the objects around us, the inconsistency which they will cause between the Old Testament and the New, requires that we should seek for other terms or another explanation; for we cannot be required to believe that of which we can have no natural ideas, or can see no counterpart in *Formation-work*.

26. Of the *Essence* of *Jehovah* we can know nothing. If it were possible to declare it, *Formation-Work* has no counterpart to express it. The mundane system was once in a state of *Non-Entity*, and would lose not only its perfection; but its very being, if it were not upheld by that power which brought it into existence. The infinite difference and diversity between the Divine and human *Essence*, as well as between the Divine *Essence* and all *Jehovah's* works, can never admit of any common terms proper to express both.

The doctrine of a *Trine-Plurality* in *Jehovah* is not beyond all created Capacity to understand.

What is beyond all created capacity to understand, cannot be revealed:
But

The *Essence* of *Jehovah* is beyond all created capacity to understand:
Ergo

The *Essence* of *Jehovah* is not revealed.

Corollary. The doctrine of a *Trine-Plurality* in *Jehovah* as revealed in Scripture cannot relate to the *Essence* of *Jehovah*, but must have reference to a *Trine-Plurality* of Operations. For if it speak not of what *Jehovah* is, it must speak of what He does.

Of Jehovah, in respect to his Essence, then we can have no idea, because there is nothing around us which is capable of conveying such knowledge to us. The terms Father, Son, Spirit, cannot respect Himself as Himself, but must regard Him in some way of *Acting* towards his creatures. All the personal distinction we can conceive in Jehovah is therefore to be founded on some ideas not expressive of his Essence. When we speak of *Father* we consider Him as acting in that character or office which the word implies, as understood from Old Testament Scriptures, and the same must be said of *Son* and *Spirit*. See 16.

27. The common acceptance of the word *Person* in the English language, viz. "A particular Individual or Corporeal existence," has led the way to the error of considering it when applied to Jehovah as indicative of his Essence. It has however by writers of celebrity in the English language been used to signify a *character*, and *character of Office*, which is the true signification of the Latin word *Persona*.—Sustineo unus tres personas, meam, judicis, et adversarii. Cic. de orat. lib. i. § 4.

We have also the following definitions of the term *Person*. "An Individual, Intelligent, Incommunicable Substance." Melancthon. "An Individual Substance of a rational Nature." Boetius. "A distinct, intelligent Being, who does really and actually subsist, and subsists distinctly from all other intelligent Beings." Athanasius.

28. There was a common agreement among the Fathers, as also of the greatest part of the Christian Church ever since their time, that *Jehovah* has revealed himself in a *Trine-Plurality*. And all who then united in this article of their common faith agreed, as almost all do now, in confessing that there is nothing in Nature to which this fundamental truth of Christianity can be compared : and that therefore mankind are as much at a loss for names or words by which this Trine-Plurality can be expressed, as they are for any conception of what it is. The Greeks used the term *Three Hypostases*, or

Three Individual Substances. But if by this is to be understood any thing *which we see in Nature, rational or irrational, animate or inanimate, that can be compared with the Individual Substance*, then there are Three Individual Substances in Jehovah. Nor will the objection be done away by arguing that by Divine Substance nothing more can be intended than Mind or Spirit: because in that case the Three Minds or Spirits in Jehovah must be equivalent to Three Jehovahs.*

* The advocates for the doctrine of a Trine-Plurality in Jehovah, a doctrine to be clearly deduced from Scripture, and on which the foundation of Christianity rests, have committed themselves most lamentably in their mode of expressing their sentiments on this topic. Speaking of the Three Persons in Jehovah, Justin Martyr calls them "Different manners of being." Tertullian declares them to be "Three Essences"—"Three Natures"—"Three Substances"—"One God with his Economy, i. e. his Son and Spirit." Hilary says, they are "Three Somewhats"—"Thrice One Substance"—and "Three Ones." Gregory Nazianzen took Adam, Eve, and Seth, as an elucidation of this mystery. Basil had recourse to the colours of the rainbow for the same purpose. Augustine says the "Three Persons" are "Three Divine Essences."—Being asked, What the Three (in Deity) were, said, "Human learning is scanty, and affords us no terms to express it; it is therefore answered—Three Persons—not as if that was to the purpose, but something must be said, and we must not be silent." De Trin. l. v. c. 9. Boethius terms them "Three Selves." So much for the Inconsistency which distinguished some eminent Christians and Scholars who flourished between the middle of the Second, and the beginning of the Sixth Century. Nor has the diffusion of knowledge which began to spread itself about a thousand years after that period, and which continues still to increase, done much towards the introduction of more clear or consistent sentiments on this subject. Melancthon, speaking of the Three Persons in Jehovah, calls them "Three Singular Intelligent Selves." The language of all his contemporaries and their successors on the continent of Europe, bore a similar character: while that of our own countrymen has in no wise differed from it. Dr. Waterland asserts that there are "Three proper distinct Persons, entirely equal to and independent of each other, yet making up One and the Same Being." Bishops Pearson and Bull held, that the "Father was the fountain of Deity: the whole Divine Nature being communicated from the Father to the Son, and from both to the Spirit." Dr. Wallis thought that "the distinction of the Three Persons was only modal." Archbishop Tillotson did the same, terming them "Three Differences." Archbishop Secker spoke of them as

The *Latins* rejected this because they acknowledged but *One Substance* in the Godhead, and therefore called them *Three Persons*. Nor were they unanimous on this point, for such as considered Person to be an absolute term, contended that the plural predication of it could not be allowed; for what is predicated absolutely must be predicated only in the singular number, and therefore that the term Person cannot be a common term for the Three in Jehovah. When therefore they asserted that there were Three Persons the Heterodoxy stood confessed, because it was equivalent to saying there were Three Essences or Three Gods. They however excused the use of such language from the necessity of agreeing upon some common term by which they might denote Jehovah as Triune. That is, having adopted a notion, they were determined, as they could find no Scripture term, to employ one of their own adaptation, notwithstanding its acknowledged unfitness to the subject.*

"Three Subsistencies." Bishop Burnet held "One Self-existent, and Two Dependent Beings," calling them "Three Diversities." Sherlock named them "Three Is's"—"Three Sames"—"Three Wholes"—"Three Substances"—"Three Things."—A Fecundity in the Divine Nature, which communicates itself to more Persons than One." A living Author says, "A numerical unity is incompetent to the Godhead. The Trinity which is predicated of the Divine Essence is nothing positive, but only a Negation of the numerical unity." Oxlee on the Trinity.

• The following extracts from the writings of a zealous champion of the orthodox creed, will shew in what manner the advocates for the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity have laid the foundation and completed the superstructure of their work.

Dr. William Sherlock in his *Present State of the Socinian Controversy*, after ringing changes on the Homousian, or one substance of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, through three hundred pages, says, "If we would rightly conceive of God, of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, of the Unity of the ever blessed Trinity, we must not form our notions by the ideas of substance and consubstantiality, which we have no distinct conceptions of; but we must learn their unity, distinction and consubstantiality, from those characters the Scripture gives of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." p. 329. Again, "If we immediately contemplate this mystery under the notion of substance, it is impossible for us to conceive One Substance and Three Hypostases, that is, in some sense Three Sub-

29. Reason can never prove that *Jehovah* is manifested to his creature Man in a *Trine-Plurality of Operations*; but when reason is satisfied that one of his creatures is so manifested in its operations, it cannot be pronounced unreasonable to assert the possibility of *Jehovah* being so likewise, since Nature is the ground-work of Revelation. But Scripture

stances, or which is all one as to the difficulty of conceiving it, though the form of expression is more Catholic, Three, each of which is the whole essence and substance, and neither of them is each other; we may turn over our minds as long as we please and change the words and phrases, but we can find no idea to answer these, or any other words of this nature." p. 330. Again, "But One Substance, and Three Hypostases, is but a secondary notion of a Trinity in Unity, to secure the Catholic Faith against the Sabellian* and Arian heresies. Against the Sabellians† the Catholic Fathers asserted Three Hypostases, against the Arians one Substance—but though One Substance and Three Hypostases be the Catholic language, yet these men begin at the wrong end, who think to form an intelligible notion of a Trinity in Unity from these abstract metaphysical terms. This is not the language of Scripture, nor have we any idea to answer these terms, of one Substance in Three distinct Hypostases, when we consider them by themselves, without relation to the Divine Nature to which alone these terms can belong, for there is no such thing in created nature and therefore we can have no idea of it." pp. 332, 333. Did Dr. Sherlock mean that if there were such a thing in created Nature, then we could have an idea of the Trinity in Unity? What Dr. S. did not dream of, is a Fact. There is such a thing in created Nature, and it gives us an idea of the Trine-Plurality of *Jehovah*. See 12.

* The language of the Greek Fathers and their followers in speaking of the *Homousian* as consisting of a real distinction without a division, and of a union without confusion, is that there may be a real diversity consistent with real unity; and that which is Multiple in one respect, may be One in another. In this way they avoid Sabellianism on one hand and Tritheism on the other. But have they avoided contradiction?

† The term *Hypostases* was adopted in opposition to the Sabellian doctrine. But as its signification *Substance* when applied to the Trinity, led immediately to the notion of Three Beings, Gods, or *Jehovahs*, it was determined in a general Council, that the term Substance, as applied to the Trinity, should not signify a distinct Being, or separate Substance, but something more than a name; i. e. something real or substantial, afterwards called Subsistence. The Latin Church dissatisfied with the word Hypostases introduced Persona or Person: which in the sense they designed leads to the very same result. Perhaps from the confusion occasioned by these two terms, the one being made synonymous with the other by not a few, arose the translation of the Greek *υποστασις* in Heb. i. 3, and xi. 1, by the two English words "Substance" and "Person." Such is the consequence of being wise above that which is written!

declares that Jehovah as *Aleim* is known in a Trine-Plurality of operations. To the necessity therefore of receiving what Scripture announces, there is also added the satisfaction of the assent which reason readily affords to the doctrine, from the conviction which our bodily senses have of its possibility. The difficulty then consists not in believing what Revelation declares on this subject, but in finding suitable terms to express our belief. The practicability of doing it seems to have entered into the minds of few. Though none can find out the Almighty to perfection, yet there are terms revealed which are applicable to his Operations. Holy Writ contains certain terms which are applied to Jehovah as expressive of a Trine-Plurality, viz. *Aleim* in the Old, and *Father, Son, Spirit*, in the New Testament. But though these have relation only to his operations, or are names of office-relation, and express the official characters of Jehovah in operation most accurately: (or how could it be known what He was, is, and will be in his dealings to his creatures,) yet men not contented with what was sufficient to all their wants in this life and that which is to come, have persisted in searching into what they are not interested to learn, and have no means of attaining, viz. his Essence. The evil of this presumptuous absurdity has not ended with the disappointment which was unavoidable. In their search for what was undiscoverable, they have applied the terms, which were given to describe Jehovah's operations towards his creatures, to the unfolding of his Essence: and in the confusion and contradiction that has ensued, have bewildered themselves still more in the words and terms which they have invented as well as adopted, to do away the absurdities of their own imaginations. Such as do not follow their example in pretending to explain how Jehovah exists, have, however, imprudently consented to use their language in too many instances. The term *Person*, which rightly understood has a reference only to what Jehovah is to, and does for his creatures, is applied to Him when his Essence is intended to be expressed; and inexplicable confusion, or misunderstanding-

ing at least, has ensued with respect to the just sentiments which men wise in their generation have otherwise held on what Scripture has revealed. No idea of a Trine-Plurality in the unity of Jehovah's Essence can be justly deduced from such expressions, and it would have been more wise to have refrained from the use of them, than by their adoption to have risked the evil which has so generally prevailed; viz. of confounding the Scripture account of Jehovah's Covenant operations with a supposed description or definition of his Essence.

30. All our ideas are taken from things around us. But when we contemplate such as set forth what Jehovah has said of himself in his Aleim character, we, too generally and unconsciously for the most part, adopt corporeal instead of spiritual imaginations from the materials thus afforded. We conceive of Jehovah after the manner of Bodies or subsistences amongst ourselves. *E. G.* The New Testament expression of *Father* suggests the idea of a pre-existent Being causing the existence of a Son, who is necessarily inferior in condition as he is posterior in order. Whereas the idea which Scripture conveys in this image, is that Jehovah is to the Church spiritually what an earthly father is carnally in relation to a Son, viz. the cause of his generation. *Jehovah* is therefore designated in Scripture, *Father*, not because He has generated a Son like unto Himself, but because He is the common Father or generator or producing cause of whatever is born from above. In like manner New Testament Scripture has termed Jehovah *Son*, not because Jehovah as Father has produced into being One, not only like, but the same in respect to Deity with Himself, but because He is to the Church what an earthly Son is in raising up an house to his father, the Builder up of the whole family of the redeemed whether in heaven or in earth. For the same reason New Testament Scriptures call Him *Spirit*, viz. because He is to all them, whom by his power he has generated, and is from time to time building up in their most holy faith, the cause of their preservation or well being in that peculiar state of spi-

ritual happiness to which He has called and will keep them. Jehovah must be contemplated after a *Spiritual* manner, but through *Material* imagery. This is confessed and allowed in the interpretation of Scriptures which do not speak of what is usually termed His Personality. Upon what ground are we then to be forced into a new mode of interpretation, which agrees so ill with Scripture itself, as with all those ideas which both Scripture and reason have sanctioned? The doctrine of a Trine-Plurality is a most prominent feature in the Old Testament, and the New Testament is not without it, though too many texts have been violently wrested to make it appear more generally diffused through that part of the sacred volume than it really is. Nor will this perversion cease till the typical representation which Jehovah has made of Himself in his operations by the terms *Father, Son, Spirit*, is spiritually interpreted through and by the typical imagery of *Fire, Light, Spirit*, of the Old Testament. It is difficult for the mind of man to divest itself of the gross carnal conceptions which intrude themselves, when the expressions *Father, Son, Spirit*, are received as explanatory of Jehovah's *Essence*,* as it is also to evade the manifest contradictions which at the same time also present themselves. If the type and antitype are to agree, the generation of a Son of the same substance with the Father, must be accompanied with the idea of parting and dividing the substance, as also of each substance so parted and divided having a distinct and separate existence. Whereas let the New Testament Trine-Plu-

* It is singular that in speaking of the *Essence* of *Jehovah* the very subject had not induced more caution than is generally observed. Jehovah with respect to his *Essence* is not the subject of definition. Whoever pretended to apprehend it by one adequate conception or notion? Every definition limits the thing defined. But Jehovah is infinite, and therefore cannot be defined. It may be asked, has not Jehovah defined his own *Essence*? Where do we find it? In the Old Testament? The term *אלהים* *Aleim* expresses only his official characters or operations to the Church. Nor do the New Testament terms of *Father, Son, Spirit*, differ.

ality of Father, Son, Spirit, be spiritually interpreted by the typical representation of Fire, Light, Spirit, of the Old Testament Trine-plurality, and the heathen interpretation or application of this their Aleim, will afford a just representation of the spiritual operations of the Lord God of the New Testament, or the Jehovah Aleim of the Old Testament: and one will be seen to effect in the Spiritual world by his operations, what the other is known to perform in the Natural.

31. A very principal cause of the rejection of a *Trine-Plurality* of operations as a Scripture elucidation of the character of Jehovah to his Church, arises from a general combination among Christians, to deny that there exists an intimation of a similar counterpart in any of Formation-works. They cannot understand upon philosophical principles how One simple Essence can act in Three, and only Three, distinct and separate operations with equal power and glory. And yet Philosophy presents every moment to their understanding the fact that such is the case in the Matter of the Heavens. Instead therefore of urging that Jehovah Aleim means a Unity of Essence in a Trine-Plurality of Operations, and must be received as setting forth the character of Jehovah to the redeemed, how much more powerful would the argument be against the adversary, if it were contended that as a creature is so constituted, how unavailing is all denial of the possibility of the First Cause being found similarly constituted in his character, or in the nature of his spiritual operations: especially as it must be confessed that Nature is the Ground work of Revelation.

32. The Names *Jah* and *Jehovah*, which are exclusively given to the First Cause, being absolute names, denote a *Unity*. *Aleim* is a name of relation: from its termination evidently denoting a *plurality*, as well as by the relatives repeatedly joined to it. "Hear, O Israel, Jehovah [the First Cause] Our Aleim [who has revealed himself to us in certain Covenant Relations] is Jehovah One." The term Aleim, when explained by its type the heavens, is seen to be

a Trine-Plurality, and in the New Testament has the names Father, Son, Spirit, given to it; but not as intended to express the Essence of the Three, or to show something natural, necessary and essential to each of them as existing in, or of the Unity. They are plain and intelligible characters, describing in what manner Jehovah has acted, and is still acting, in the execution of the divine purposes towards the objects of his love. As the word Aleim speaks of Covenant engagements, its force, meaning or intention is necessarily limited to them for whom those engagements were entered into. Jehovah brought the primordial particles of all things into being, has carried them to the present perfection, and is the temporal preserver of every thing. In him all live, and move, and have their being, for all are his offspring. But this is irrespective of the Trine-Plurality of his Aleim operations, which he vouchsafes to them who are saved with an everlasting salvation. This name has respect to that alone; and it expresses what Jehovah is to them in the way of everlasting love, abounding mercy, and plenteous redemption. The New Testament terms of *Father, Son, Spirit*, which are correspondent to the Old Testament term *Aleim*, have no regard to the Essence of Him who has revealed himself in the Trine-Plurality, nor are designed to express the manner of his existence who is Aleim, for this is and must remain unknown as well to them who are subjects of Covenant love as to them who are not. They refer to the boundless grace and loving kindness which was purposed in Christ before the world began. As to the term *Father* in Jehovah being expressive of his Essence and as *begetting a Son*, of this Scripture is as silent as it plainly speaks of what Jehovah as a Father is to his elect children, viz. **אב** their spiritual generator. "I will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." It is these sons and daughters who, receiving the Spirit of adoption, cry, "Abba, Father." They proclaim Jehovah to be their Father, or declare him who is revealed in a Trine-Plurality

of operations to have begotten them again, according to his Covenant engagement, to a lively hope: but they in no wise speak of the Essence of Jehovah, or the distinction of a plurality in him as to his manner of Individual existence. They exclaim with joy unspeakable, and full of anticipated glory, "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on us, that we should be called the Sons of God"! And as sons, heirs of God, joint heirs with Christ our elder Brother! To which inheritance the "Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning, of his own will begat us with the word of truth"! It is the Father who is in heaven that giveth to them good things when they ask him, namely, all spiritual blessings. It is this Father whose good pleasure it is to give them the kingdom. It is this Father who hath made them meet for the inheritance of the saints in light, whom they worship in Spirit and truth, *i. e.* spiritually and truly in his Son, his creature and Servant Jesus, who is the Spirit of all the signs and shadows of the law, and who is the truth of all the promises and prophecies of the Old Testament. Jehovah is indeed a Father to the men of this World, to all such as have their portion in this World. He maketh the Sun to shine on the unjust, and the earth to bring forth her increase for their use: but these benefits have their rise from a different source, and are directed to a different end. They spring not from Jehovah as Aleim, and are not fraught with any spiritual mercies.

33. When it is considered how the term *Father*, as applied to One of the *Trine-Plurality* in which Jehovah manifests himself, is to be understood, *viz.* as not descriptive of his Essence, but as declarative of one of his operations, or of a peculiar Agency toward the Church, the meaning of the term *Son* as applied to another of the *Trine-Plurality* will be sufficiently obvious. The term *Son* must then be considered not as correlate to *Father*, but in the relation, character, or office which he bears to them that were chosen to Salvation, according to the Covenant of Jehovah Aleim with his Son

Jesus, the First-born of every creature. Here again reference must be had to the Hebrew language for a suitable meaning of the term Son. The Hebrew word for *Son* is בן, from בנה, to build, because the son builds up or continues his father's house in existence. A son in point of fact proceeds or is derived from his father, but is not one and the same as his father; for he is not only distinct and separate from him in Individuality, but posterior to him in time, and by nature inferior in rank and power. The term of Sonship cannot therefore be applicable to a natural filiation in or of Jehovah. In the שמים "Heavens," or the אלהים "Aleim" of the Heathen, the type of the true Aleim, Light proceeds not from Fire. It is One and the same Matter with that which is called Fire, but in another condition or state of operation. The Matter or Substance is in both cases essentially the same in its atomical parts or characters. That which is termed Light varies only in its condition from that which is termed Fire, for these atoms which are in the Condition of Light take the condition of Fire without any diminution in their number, or change in their Essence. The Atoms of that which is called Light being only in a state of less activity, or in a greater degree of mutual cohesion or coalition than that which is in the condition of Fire. Fire gives birth to all things, and Light, which is the same Matter as Fire only in another Condition, carries them to their allotted state of perfection, or builds them up. This is the office-character of Jehovah when in the edification of the heavenly Jerusalem he assumes the name of Son בן. The term Son attributed to One of the Trine-Plurality of operations, as found in Matt. xxviii. 19, no more requires that there should be a correlation between it and the preceding term Father, than with the succeeding term Holy Ghost. Neither reason nor Revelation will admit it in the last instance: and nothing in the present or any former day would have made pious men attempt to deduce it from the juxta-position of the terms in the first, had not an undue deference to the opinions of learned

men, or the prejudices of education, prevailed over both reason and Revelation. The term Son is used with so great a latitude in Holy Writ that, unless the true cause was obvious, it would seem impossible that so many reflecting and sagacious minds should have embraced this error. Let the following ideas, as they are applied in Scripture, be considered: viz. "Sons of death—of the prophets—of Belial—of perdition—Children or Sons *viz* of the Devil—of darkness—of disobedience—of the world—of wrath"; and it will not be difficult to estimate the true signification of the term Son which is attributed to Jehovah, as he is revealed in a Trine-Plurality of operations. The ideas of dependence and inferiority are necessarily connected with Sonship in all things belonging to the mundane system: but these are as inconsistent with the type which Jehovah has given of himself, as Himself, as they are with the Antitype. Light is neither inferior to Fire nor dependent upon it: for the fluid called Light, or that Matter in the fluid state called Light, is one and the same with that called Fire in its component parts, varying only in the action of those parts, and by the different degrees of their coalescence. Neither is dependent on the other; for in fact that which is called Light preceded originally that which is called Fire (Gen. i. 3, compared with ver. 16.) though it is generally regarded as consequent to it. The terms Father and Son, which have been shewn to be as antitypes co-significant with Fire and Light, can therefore have no relation to what they are by or in that which constitutes their Essence. They must and do refer, as their real signification in the Hebrew tongue indicates, to the offices which Jehovah sustains in the Economy of Grace to the Church. That One of the Trine-Plurality Operations which marks or constitutes the particular Office-Character denominated Son, is not so termed as Jehovah, for Office is not Essence, but denotes Jehovah in a peculiar operation. The names Fire and Light do not describe nor define the Essence of the Matter of the heavenly fluid: they only declare those condi-

tions or modes of action in which it displays its power. In the same manner the names Father and Son have no reference to the Essence of Jehovah. They are given only to shew how he acts in those Two of his Trine-Plurality operations, when he unfolds his purposes of love and mercy in the Man Jesus Christ towards them who were chosen in him before the foundation of the world.

34. All that is revealed concerning the Church of God, or can now be known, is set forth in type or figure. And if the type which Old Testament Scripture so repeatedly gives is to be a guide, the Unity of Jehovah in a Trine-Plurality of operations, in the redemption of his Church, is placed beyond a doubt. The Matter of the Heavenly Fluid, or the Material Aleim, Ps. viii. 5, is a Unity known in the Trine-Plurality operation of Fire, Light, Spirit. The *Fire* is apparently *First in order*. The *Light*, which is the heavenly Fluid in a less active state of motion, is apparently *Second in order*. The *Spirit*, which is the Matter of the Heavens with its atoms in a more concreted or conglomerated, or less active state, is apparently *Third in order*. But this is only an order of accidental operation, and not of unerring necessity, being frequently inverted, and agrees well with the New Testament names Father, Son, Spirit, rightly understood. This order however argues no inferiority, since the Matter of the Heavens, where ever it is in operation, is in each of its Three Conditions sole ruler: and whatever its Essence be, it has that Essence in all its fulness, nothing being wanting in either one or other of the remaining Two Conditions to perfect it. How suitable, intelligible, and significant a representation is this of Jehovah in his Trine-Plurality work of grace towards the children of men! The terms First, Second, Third, can imply neither priority nor superiority in Jehovah, since He exists in each of his operations in all the fulness of will, power, action. In the beginning of the Mundane system, and Scripture speaks of no other, when Jehovah brought into being the Substance or Atomic principia of the Heavens, and

the substance or atomic particles of the terraqueous globe; the Matter of the heavens was in that state called *רושך*, *i. e.* its atoms were in a state of perfect rest, of course that Matter had not any manifest existence as Spirit, Light, Fire; though that which was to be manifested as Fire, Light, Spirit was in being. The Matter of the Heavens might for ever have continued in that state. But wisdom had designed it for purposes of increasing love and mercy as long as the mundane system should subsist. He therefore put it into that action called Spirit, next Light, and then put it in the condition or state of action called Fire into a central Orb to continue the circulation of the Matter so set in motion from one end of the mundane system to the other. To as many as Nature shall stand confessed as the ground-work of revelation this will appear no cunningly devised fable, or fanciful typical representation of what Jehovah is pleased to reveal of himself in his ways towards man. Jehovah might have continued, as it respects the mundane system, what he was as Jehovah for ever. As far as Scripture gives any information; if he had continued inoperative, or without forming the terraqueous globe and its inhabitants, his Trine-Plurality would have remained unmanifested, unknown. But to display his Power, Wisdom, &c. it pleased him to become operative. Then He brought into being and revealed himself to Him who was "the Beginning of the creation of God," in a Three-fold way of love and mercy, to be manifested as such as long as the performance of Covenant engagements concerning the elect should require. When these shall end by their completion, then the Mediatorial Kingdom of his Son Jesus, his first-born and only-begotten, shall end also, and Jehovah as in the beginning shall be all in all.

But notwithstanding such order, if the type is to have any weight, it is an error of no small magnitude to make the Father to be the *Fons Deitatis*, or to sustain the majesty of Deity. The Scripture account of the operation of the type is in an inverted ratio to what is usually considered from ap-

pearance to be the case. That condition of the Matter or Substance which fills the mundane system every where, where no other matter is, called Spirit, appeared first, Gen i. 2, then that which is called Light, ver. 3, and lastly that which is called Fire, ver. 16. If the experience of those who are the subjects of the wonderful work of Covenant Love is consulted, Jehovah as Spirit or acting in the character implied by the term Spirit, takes of the things of the Pre-existent Man and enables the elect to call him Lord, and this is the First in the order of operation. Jehovah as Son, or acting in the office-character implied by the term Son, carrying on the work he has begun, is Second in order of operation; and Jehovah as Father, acting in the office-character implied by the term Father, accepting them whom he hath begotten to a lively hope in and for the sake of the Beloved, is the Third in the order of operation. But this or any other order has no foundation in the Divine Essence and no authority of Holy Writ for its use, and it is capable of abuse, and has actually led the way to unworthy conceptions of Jehovah revealed as operating in a Trine-Plurality. Until therefore the type is understood, it is in vain to expect that any should be found to give their consent on grounds of ratiocination to the scriptural fact that Jehovah is One revealed in a Trine-Plurality. Nor until the *modus operandi* of the Type, which is so notorious though little comprehended by mankind, is understood of them, can it be expected that any explanatory terms can do otherwise than excite ideas which revolt against all past or present experience. The Christian, however, who has learned these things, comforts himself with knowing that truth is great and will finally prevail.

35. The name Son is indicative of Jehovah in operation, but has no reference to his Essence. As Jehovah he has no Son in Essence, though One in the Trine-Plurality of his operations is called Son for the reasons already given. *Jehovah the Son*, or the *Son of Jehovah*, is not scriptural language, nor to be deduced from Scripture. And the parallel

expression of *God* the *Son* is equally unscriptural. It appears to have been substituted for the words *Son of God*, which without foundation have been supposed to mean That one of the Trine-Plurality named Son. But here great violence has been offered not only to the language of Holy Writ, but of the Greek and Latin Classics, which it is not unreasonable to imagine might have led many to discover this obvious error. *בן אלהים*, *Son of God* frequently occurs, but *בן יהוה*, *Son of Jehovah* never. If the former had been always rendered *Son of Aleim*, the error would probably have never occurred which has laid the foundation for the scoffs, if not the heresies, of Arians and Socinians, and given so much offence to Jews, Turks, and Infidels, as often as the Christian faith has been submitted to their consideration. *Son of Jehovah* would offend every Christian: and what is there less revolting in the expression *Son of God*, if by God the idea of The First Cause, the only true God or Jehovah, is intended to be conveyed? Has not the expression Son of God, instead of Son of Aleim, as an equivalent for *בן אלהים*, laid the foundation for confounding the Essence of Jehovah with his Covenant offices or characters? Has it not been the principal cause of attributing a Filiation of his own Essence to Jehovah? But although this error is easily discovered, and as easily remedied, from the Old Testament Scriptures, what clue is there in the New Testament to carry through that seemingly inextricable labyrinth which every where presents itself in the English and every other Version? Jehovah is most plainly revealed as Son in the Sacred Volume. The Jews confessed it formerly, though their posterity have done their utmost in later times to efface every vestige of this confession. They acknowledged that "Son" was one of Jehovah's names, or characters as Aleim, and that "Father" and "Spirit" were two other. Christians make the same confession: but how few obtain their knowledge of this fundamental truth from the same source as the Sons of Abraham. These last at one period saw only Office-characters in the terms *אב, בן, רוח*, *אב, בן, רוח*.

“Father, Son, Spirit.” * These notions, found principally among the Cabbalists, were of a much earlier date, occurring also in the beginning of Raboth, books esteemed more ancient than the Talmud. The Unity of the Deity was however always the foundation of their faith. How then must these Three Degrees, Lights, Modes, have been considered by them to make them consistent? Is not the opinion of the later Jews, *i. e.* since the Incarnation, making them relate to the Divine Essence, irreconcilable with the sentiments of their forefathers? And have not Christians in adopting these sentiments run into the same error with the later Jews, and in the same manner laid the foundation for the rejection by too many of the Bible truth, that Jehovah One, is revealed in a Trine-Plurality of operations?

The disputes of the modern Jews with Christians is grounded on a supposition, to which the seed of Abraham their more immediate forefathers stood equally exposed, *viz.* that they are Tritheists. In design neither of them are such, though the language of both leads to that result. If the Jews from the time of the Incarnation to the present day, had been as diligent in searching into the traditions which relate to their doctrines, as in spending their time in the study of their rites, they would have discovered the views which their forefathers had of a Trine-Plurality of operations in Jehovah; and they would, instead of losing sight of every vestige of their faith on this point, have been able to give a right direction to the Christian Church, which nearly at its formation swerved from the truth on this fundamental doctrine. And if Christians had from the same period been as sedulous in

* The doctrine of a *Trine-Plurality* was not strange nor unacceptable to the earlier *Jews*. They attributed the names of Jehovah to the second and third Sephiroth. Zohar in R. Menachem, fol. 3, col. 3, fol. 10, col. 4. They speak of Three degrees and Three modes in the Godhead. Allix Judgmt. of the Jewish Church, p. 170—of the letter *w* in its Three branches denoting the Holy Fathers of Deut. vi. 4—of Three Lights in Jehovah, and that these Three being void of all polytheism make but One Jehovah.

searching into the Hebrew Scriptures for a proper understanding of the Unity of Jehovah as revealed in a Trine-Plurality of operations for the redemption of his Church, as in adopting the errors of the apostate Jews, and in ingrafting upon them sentiments at which common sense too often recoils, (see p. 19) they would have been spared the grief of witnessing those perversions of the Oracles of truth, which have not more disgraced the rational understanding of man, than they have tended to destroy the peace of society. They would have seen, and it was the genius of their language which would have led them to see it, that these terms had no respect to the Essence of Jehovah. Christians who know not the Hebrew tongue, or are content to learn it from the Apostate Jews, or from those who have adopted their plans of polluting the pure streams of Hebrew literature, take the terms *πατηρ, υιος, πνευμα*, "Father, Son, Spirit," in their adopted sense; and so have converted appellations indicative of Covenant engagements or Office-characters only, into names of Essence. Hence with them *Son* means the offspring of the Father, and *Son of God* a name declarative of the Essence of One of the Trine-Plurality in which Jehovah is revealed to the Church. They are unable to see that a Trine-Plurality is asserted, and can be maintained to be in the manifestation which Jehovah has made of himself in his Covenant operations, without the Scriptures giving any explanation of what his Essence is; which Essence however the Scriptures announce to be consistent with a strict Unity in a Trine-Plurality of operations.

36. It may be denied, but upon investigation it will be found to be true, that for want of due conceptions of that which was intended to give mankind right notions upon the subject of the *Trine-Plurality*, the Christian world has long exposed itself to the scoffs of the enemies of the truth as it is in Jesus. To ascertain this point it will be necessary to examine how the *parallel* runs between the *type* and the *Antitype*.

The Matter of the heavens in its condition of **חשך** or "perfect rest" is capable of becoming **רוח, אור, אש, Spirit, Light, Fire**, but it is not so naturally, necessarily, and unceasingly. The first Cause, termed Jah, Jehovah, is revealed in a Trine-Plurality of operations denominated **אלהים** in Hebrew, and **πατήρ, υιός, πνεύμα**, in Greek, and **Father, Son, Spirit** in English Scriptures. But he is not what these words in their plain sense import naturally, necessarily, and unceasingly.

When the Universe in a chaotic state was to be made **κοσμος**, mundus, the Matter or Substance which fills the mundane system every where, where no other Matter is, in its first state of **חשך** did not cease to be in any of its original powers or perfections, but began to be in a state of operation. From **חשך**, or a state of perfect quiescence, it became **רוח**, or in motion. This action caused a separation between the fluid and solid parts of the chaotic terraqueous globe. Of the whole Matter of the heavens thus in motion one half became **אור** or in a state of more accelerated motion. This half acting simultaneously with the other in the condition of **רוח** (the two called in their united action *firmament*, **רקיע** Gen. i. 6) but in an opposite and contrary direction, sorted the solid parts of the chaotic mass into homogeneous portions: or wherever similar substances were, they were then brought together. In this state the waters, being separated from the solids, and then, by the action of the Firmament, or the whole body of the Matter of the heavens acting in those opposite directions, drained from the surface of the consolidated globe, the earth was made to bring forth grass, herbs, and fruit trees of every kind. This was effected by the power of Jehovah, in the hand of his Son and Servant the Pre-existent Man, acting upon his creature the Matter of the heavens, when as yet it was not manifested in its most rapid state of action termed Fire **אש**. On the fourth day of formation-work, a portion of the Matter of the heavens was placed by the same hand in the action of Fire in the solar orb, there termed **חמה**, to con-

tinue the action of that portion of the Matter of the heavens which was in Spirit רוח and Light אור, amongst, upon, and in the bodies of the orbs; and by those actions to preserve the things that were already formed in their new condition, to bring others into similar forms, and to continue the revolution of the Earth and the other Orbs round their own axis, and at the same time round the central solar Fire. The Matter of the heavens acts upon the earth in two only of its Trine-Plurality of operations or conditions, viz. that of Light and Spirit, and they are distinct each from the other, though the Matter which is in each one of these conditions in no wise differs from the other in essence, power, or perfection. Moreover from the time that the solar orb, the central point of their united action, where the Matter or Substance, &c. in the condition of Light issues from, and that in the condition of Spirit returns to it, was set up, and as Jehovah's vicegerent carried on the operations of the Matter of the heavens, this manner of manifesting the Trine-Plurality of the type has continued, though it cannot be called natural, or necessary, nor will it be unceasing.

37. When man, who as he comes into this world is through the Fall without spiritual understanding and filled with all unrighteousness, is to be formed anew, the First Cause does not cease to be what He was, nor becomes what he was not, in His Essence, powers, or perfections, but begins to be in a state of operation, and consequently of manifestation to the elect, what he was from the beginning, אֵת אֱלֹהִים. From יְהוָה, or the First Cause in a state of inoperation, (having long left to themselves the vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory) He is to them רוח Spirit, or in one of his אֱלֹהִים Aleim operations, the Spirit of knowledge, of counsel, of wisdom, of understanding, of truth, of grace and glory. This separates the man from himself. He who was before inert to all good, with faculties capable of knowing and glorifying Jehovah, but those faculties stupified and besotted through the working of those evil propensities which the Fall

had introduced, having the Spirit breathed into him, begins to live and move towards Him in whom he lives and moves and has his being. He who was as a stagnant pool of all uncleanness, dead through trespasses and sin, being quickened, finds within him as it were a company of two armies ; the Flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the Flesh. Thus he stands convicted of iniquity, transgression, and sin. Jehovah next becomes אור Light in another of his אלהים Aleim operations, or shining into the hearts of the objects of his grace, to give each at the appointed time the knowledge of his glory in the person of Jesus Christ. He reveals to him and in him the Son of his love. Thus he is convinced of righteousness, and becomes Light in the Lord Jehovah, whose understanding had been wholly darkened through the ignorance that was in him. And here let it be observed, that the revelation of Jehovah's purposes of mercy, and the blessed effects wrought upon the heart and shewn in the life of the subject of this unspeakable love, is the immediate operation of Jehovah in Two only of his Trine-Plurality operations, and that these operations are not only distinct each from the other, but that they have each a different manner of manifestation, though in each it is Jehovah in all the fulness of his Essence, Power or Perfections. Let it be also observed that the distinction of each in the Trine-Plurality in which Jehovah is revealed, is not founded upon a distinction of Essence, which is the same in all its powers, properties and fulness in each, but this Distinction is manifested to man, and therefore, as far as he is taught, is founded upon the distinct manner in which Jehovah acts to the highly favoured objects of his Covenant work. The human mind has no difficulty in understanding how each of the Trine-Plurality operations in the Matter of the heavenly fluid is distinct, at the same time that they are all strictly of one and the same Matter or Substance. It is equally easy for the mind of man to conceive how all the powers, perfections, and fulness of Jehovah can subsist and appear distinctly in each and all of

His Three modes of operations, at the same time that they are strictly of one and the same Jehovah.

Philosophy has established the former fact: and He who cannot err has in the volume of the Book not only made the Type the foundation of his Revelation to men, of what he is to them in the way of love and mercy, but has recorded it there for their consolation and confirmation, when their own evil hearts of unbelief shall be tempted to doubt the reality of the Antitype, and for a refutation of the blasphemies of the gainsayer when he shall deny that that is to be found in Jehovah, which the daily experience of his own senses proves to exist in one of his creatures.* Truth as truth cannot of itself convince the gainsayer. This is the work of the Spirit applying the truth to the conviction of them who oppose themselves against it. But truth mixed with error, designedly or not, or truth tortured into error by perverse ingenuity or blind obstinacy, will be found to confirm the gainsayer in the error of his ways.

38. If the doctrine of *Jehovah* in a *Trine-Plurality* be

* Whatsoever it has pleased Jehovah to reveal, it is the duty of man to receive, though he cannot be required so to do without being able to comprehend what is revealed: and that cannot be said to be revealed to a Man which he is unable to comprehend. Jehovah has revealed himself to be Aleim, What this means may be learned like every other spiritual truth from some thing in Nature's Works which is set forth under a similar character. The Heavens are called Aleim. These are One yet Three. Not Three in Essence, but in their mode of operation, This fact is very generally acknowledged, and would be universally so if all were possessed of the necessary information. None pretend to know what is the Essence of the Matter or Substance called in one of its conditions Fire, and in the other two Light and Spirit. Man is satisfied with noting the varied action or influence of this Matter or Substance on the things contained in or forming part of the mundane system, because his reason and experience convince him that more is not attainable. Revelation announces Jehovah to be Aleim, or Three in his mode of operation, but is silent as to his Essence. True wisdom points out the necessity of desisting from any attempt to investigate in the First Cause, what reason is satisfied cannot be discovered in the first principles of his creatures.

revealed, is not mankind justified in supposing that it must be plainly revealed in the Oracles of truth? How comes it to pass then that perhaps no two who love and fear Jehovah are agreed upon what is made known on this subject in Holy Writ? Was it always so? Or is it only during the last sixteen Centuries that Christians have exhibited such scenes of turbulence and bloodshed and bitterness of language on this subject as would have disgraced the annals of heathenism? *
 יהוה Jehovah as referred to the First Cause signifies Him who has a Being: and as this Being never had a beginning nor can have an end, it may be lawfully inferred that he is

* During the First two Centuries, the Church did not attempt by any explicit articles to define the *Trine-Plurality* in which *Jehovah* is revealed. Every one was satisfied with his own speculations without entering into a controversy concerning metaphysical or philosophical distinctions relative to the manner or nature of it. Is there no compass to guide the Spiritual mariner in his course amid the rocks and quicksands which have made shipwreck of the love, gentleness, meekness, and long suffering of so many, and of the faith of perhaps still more? Is the Christian world doomed from want of Scriptural information to invent without end modes of elucidation, and terms of explanation? If the gospel trumpet could be made for ages past to utter only an uncertain sound, and from the unsuccessful efforts of thousands it does not appear that it was Jehovah's pleasure that it should be otherwise, let recourse be had in these last times to the Law and to the Testimony, and let the result be reported. The Apostle Paul declared that in his day, they to whom, and in whom Jehovah had revealed his Son, saw spiritual things reflected from types or emblems; *αὐτοὶ δὲ σκοποῦντες ὡς ἀνιγμένας*, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, "Now by means of a mirror ænigmatically," and that in another state or dispensation they would be seen as they really are, *πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον*, 1 Cor. xiii. 12. "Face to face." To what extent the Apostle intended this should be carried, is learned from another place, where he says, that "the invisible things of Jehovah even his eternal power and Godhead are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." To some acknowledged type the Church is therefore now directed to learn what is revealed of the ways of God to his creature man: and in such typical representation it may be safely contended, that Christians not only can but assuredly do behold what Jehovah has thought necessary to manifest concerning his operations to the children of men. He proclaimed his Name to be *יהוה אלהים* Jehovah Aleim, and what this name imported is the point to be resolved.

self-existent in parte antè as well as à parte post. But this can only be inferred, for the name יהוה Jehovah says nothing of WHAT He is, only that HE IS.

אלהים Aleim has no reference to Being; it speaks of what Jehovah DOES for them who are the children of God in all generations. אלה is "to swear" or "covenant on oath." Jehovah therefore declares himself to have "sworn" or "covenanted on oath" in a plurality of ways; or in other words that he is to be known to his Church in a Plurality of Operations: for that Aleim is plural is certain by being joined to adjectives, pronouns, and verbs plural. How many operations this Plurality comprehends and what is its peculiar character, is to be deduced from the use of the term when applied to other objects beside Jehovah. He asserts, Deut. iv. 39. That "he is Aleim in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else," and upbraids Israel for sacrificing "to Aleim whom they knew not." Deut. xxxii. 17. "Which are yet no Aleim." Jer. ii. 11. Now Jehovah was to the faithful seed of Abraham the only true and living Aleim. Him the heathens knew not, but in his stead they set up his creature את השמים the Matter of the Heavens, and called it אלהים Aleim, and looked to it for what Jehovah alone could bestow, viz. protection, victory, happiness. The את השמים or the Matter of the Heavens is resolved by the heathens into a Trine-Plurality of operations, viz. Fire, Light, Spirit. They made these its Three conditions, viz. בעל the "Spirit," Judg. viii. 32. כמרש the "Fire," Judg. xi. 24. מלכם the "Light," 1 Kings xi. 33. Aleim. This was the masterpiece of Satan. חשך the name given to the Matter of the heavens, before it was in operation, afterwards called שמים when it became operative in all its fulness was the origin of the heathen Aleim, אש, רוח, בן, Fire, Light, Spirit. The heathens did not consider these operations as separate powers, subsisting and acting independently each of itself. They well knew that they were only different operations of the same Matter which concurred in every effect produced in the Mundane

System. They acknowledged the joint action of the Substance of the heavens in its Material Trine-Plurality of operations, while they distinguished and gave glory to that particular One which ruled on any peculiar occasion. But more, They applied the terms אש, אור, רוח, *Fire, Light, Spirit*, and attributed similar effects to their agency on their bodies or outward man, as the worshippers of Jehovah did to Him as בן, רוח, אב, *Father, Son, Spirit*, to their souls or inward man. In doing this they however in these names, or in the powers which they intended to express by them, made no reference to the Essence of what they set up for Aleim. They saw in the original קשך nothing more than the state or condition of their object of worship before it went forth to action; and in שמים, the name given after it became operative, they saw nothing more than its actions either singly or jointly, when it began and continued to go forth for the forming, building up, and upholding themselves and all things around them. The notion that the Aleim of the heathens were created spiritual Angels, instead of the Substance of the heavens in its several conditions and operations, has arisen from the Greek version of the Hebrew Text, and the supposed agreement with it in the Apostolical use of the term *αγγελοι* "Angels." The writings of the more ancient Jews confronted with other parts of the LXX. translation, where these enemies of our faith have betrayed their design; and the philosophical part of both Old and New Testament, particularly the epistles of Paul, abundantly testify that the Aleim of the early heathen, the creature of Jehovah, means the Matter or Substance which fills the Mundane system every where, where no other Matter is, in its several conditions and operations, and is especially intended by the *αγγελοι* "angels" of the later heathen.

It would be sufficient merely to state, that words are the signs or representatives of those things which are the objects of man's senses or the subjects of his intellectual discussions, and that as there is no one thing on which man's senses can act or his intellect can take in that which is capable of de-

scribing or defining the **Essence of Jehovah**; so there can be no one word to convey any idea concerning it. But the terms **Father, Son, Spirit**, considered in the only language by which their true meaning can be determined, have no reference to the **Essence of Him to whom Scriptures apply them**: at the same time that they most fully and clearly set forth what he is in his covenant engagements to them for whom he became **Aleim**. This point is now to be proved. **Jehovah** at the beginning of **Formation-work** calls himself אֱלֹדִים. This ascertains that he had entered into **Covenant engagements** before the work of formation was begun. The sacred Volume amply and satisfactorily details what these engagements were, and how they have been hitherto performed: and if attentively considered they will shew how far the terms **Father, Son, Spirit**, are declaratory of this fearful and glorious work, and how their signification is fully exemplified in their accomplishment of it.

From his own constitutional character as well as that of every thing around him, man is obliged in all his enquiries after truth to rest at that point which in conformity with Scripture he calls "the Beginning." Beyond this all is impenetrable darkness. Yet in his vain attempt to develope acts which he would fain suppose took place before this, he has invented significations for words, which, in the nature of things and the internal evidence of the languages from which they are deduced, it is impossible can belong to them. For instance the word **Eternity** is asserted to mean that remote and indefinable state when **Jehovah** alone was existing in perfect happiness, concentered in Himself, and in the enjoyment of his own fulness. That such was his state there can be no doubt: but that the word **Eternity** or the still more extraordinary term **Everlasting** should have any relation to such a state, is obviously contradicted by the words themselves. What can the term **Everlasting**, i. e. **Lasting-Ever**, have to do with a state of existence which had no beginning? Or how can the term **Eternity** relate to that state, if the Hebrew

words נצח, 1 Sam. xv. 29; עד, Isa. lvii. 15; עולם, Jer. x. 10, Micah v. 2, which are made its equivalent, (see English Version Text and Margin,) are to guide us to a right knowledge of its real signification? It would be loss of time only to suggest the absurdity of supposing its concrete form Eternal, in the Greek Scripture αἰωνιος, to have any leaning towards such a signification as is generally attributed to it, as derived from the abstract form Eternity: or to urge the impossibility of the word Beginning, as deduced from בראשית, Gen. i. 1, מראש, ראשית, Prov. viii. 22, 23, or from the corresponding εναρχη, John i. 12, εξαρχης, John vi. 64, αρχης, 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 John ii. 13, having any reference to such a sense. On no better ground, however, Scriptures are made to reveal transactions relative to parties which had no existence: and to give them an air of veri-similitude, the name אלהים, which Jehovah has furnished to ascertain the boundary line, at least as far as the Divine record teaches man, between the remote and indefinable state in which he was, as far as the mundane system is concerned, Self and Sole existent, and that beginning of his goings forth in works of power, love, grace, and goodness to his creature man, has been pronounced, in opposition to the internal evidence which it carries along with it, to declare his Essence; and the corresponding terms Πατηρ, Υιος, Πνευμα, *Father, Son, Spirit*, are pressed as elucidations of the truth of such avowment. But as Scriptures speak, and from the nature of every language can speak, only of what Jehovah has done since time began in the mundane system, and as nothing before that moment can be brought within the grasp of our intellect, from the inability of words to express, and of our powers to receive it; a consciousness of our ignorance and submission to the will of Jehovah should make us satisfied with what is revealed, and endear to us the wisdom and grace which has discovered so much.

Jehovah then was, as Jehovah, simply, absolutely, and necessarily concentered in himself, and in the enjoyment of

his own fulness, without beginning, Self and Sole Existent. Yet while all this can be truly asserted, Man has no experimental knowledge of what it really means. In this state he was necessarily inoperative, though of this also we can form no idea. It pleased Him however to begin to act, and the beginning of Jehovah's works with respect to the mundane system, was his only begotten Son Jesus. "He is before all things." Jehovah, like the type in the condition of **אחד**, One, was thus concentrated in Himself while inoperative; and like that type, when he began to act, he manifested himself as Three in operation: yet also like the type still an Indivisible One in his Essence. Incomprehensible as these his goings forth in his Trine-Plurality as to their mode must ever remain, as they are likewise with respect to the constituted symbol of his wonderful workings, yet the possibility of such a thing is made credible by its existence in the typical representation, as the certainty of it is assured in the constituting this creature to be the typical and permanent representation of his ways to man.*

39. With a very few exceptions the advocates for the pure and undefiled religion of *Jesus*, understand by the expression *Son of God* a Filiation in the Essence of Jehovah. The description of the Son of God, viz. that he came down from heaven, was sent of the Father, made of a woman, &c. &c.

* The language of some of the opponents of the Catholic Fathers, in speaking of the *Trine-Plurality* as designated under the names of *Father, Son, Spirit*, is that they are Economic names, and not names of Essence, or appropriate to Deity as Deity. E. G. The Father is of the Essence, not a or the Father as having a Son. The Son is of the Essence, not a or the Son as begotten of the Father. The Spirit is of the Essence, not a or the Spirit as proceeding from the Father and the Son. Jehovah is Three but not Father, Son, Spirit naturally, necessarily, eternally, as the common acceptation of the terms Father, Son, Spirit import: because there cannot be a description or definition of Him of whom no description can be given and no definition made. He who is Jehovah is Father, Son, Spirit, or is revealed in his official characters or operations, but his official characters or operations of Father, Son, Spirit, do not express that he is Jehovah.

has occasioned no distrust, while ingenuity has been put to the rack to devise terms to confound the gainsayer of this supposed fundamental truth of Christianity. Jews, Turks, and Infidels of every denomination, in vain protest against its absurdity and its palpable contradiction to the whole tenor of the Sacred Volume in which it is said to be found. The necessity of inferiority and subordination in a Son, which is urged with so much weight, instead of producing doubt on the doctrine which makes the same Essence prior and posterior, co-equal and unequal, has led only to a further distortion of the plain and unequivocal language of Holy Writ. An unoriginated Essence is said to be derived, communicated, &c. One who is possessed of all things, has all things given into his hands, and all things put under him. One who changeth not, prays for the restoration of a glory which he once had but was then without. The expedient by which this tissue of oppositions is made to harmonize, is a Mediatorial kingdom, crown and glory belonging to this filiated nature in Jehovah, distinct from the universal, unalienable and unceasing kingdom, crown and glory which he has as the blessed and only Potentate. But where has this zeal for the honour of Jehovah discovered such a Mediator? The unity of Jehovah is not more clearly asserted than the created Essence of the Mediator. In 1 Tim. ii. 5, He is pronounced "the Man Jesus Christ." In Heb. viii. 1, 6, "An High Priest." In Heb. ix. 11, 14, "An High Priest offering himself unto God." The fact also of the expression *Son of God* being equivalent with the Man Jesus Christ is clear from Matt. xxvii. 54, compared with Mark xv. 39, Luke xxiii. 47.

40. The names by which the *First Cause* has distinguished himself are all adapted to the state and wants of sinners. As they must believe that *He is*, he has called himself יה יה Jah and יהוה יהovah.* As they must acknowledge that he *Is*

* What Is naturally, necessarily and independently, is Self-existent. But Jah Jehovah Is naturally, necessarily and independently. Ergo,

over all he has taken the title of *עליון* *Most High*. As they are to learn that in a state of nature they are "without God in the world," he has in the beginning of the Sacred Volume, and abundantly throughout it, declared himself to be *אלהים* *Aleim*.* *Covenanting* on their behalf in a Three-fold manner. As they will ever need comfort, *flagrante delicto*, he has revealed himself as *אל* *Mediator*.† There is a second Medi-

Jah Jehovah is Self-existent—though neither name expresses it. What has its existence from communication, derivation or begetting, exists at the pleasure or will of another, or is not self-existent. But Jehovah has not his existence from communication, derivation or begetting. Ergo, Jehovah exists not at the pleasure or will of another, but is Self-existent.

* Jehovah as *אלהים* *Aleim* proclaims the great Economy of Salvation. The names attributed to each of the Trine-Plurality operations, make known to men the rise, progress, and completion of this glorious work. They set forth its causes, effects, and means. They speak also of its objects, ordinances, and privileges. *אלהים* *Aleim* refers only to that transaction, and exhibits Jehovah as working it out. It manifests Him as *Three in his modes of operation*, without the possibility of confounding any One of them with the other Two. Each is distinct and separate, yet each and all together is a manifestation of Jehovah One. The names given to the Three as they respect men are also relative. They denote nothing of Essence, but some Thing or Quality which the subject of each name bears to another subject. A name of Essence has its meaning in the subject itself. A relative name has no meaning without the consideration of the subject to which it belongs. There is no foundation in Scripture for any name of Essence in Jehovah. All his names, except Jah and Jehovah, are characteristic appellations of Himself under some relation to his creatures: and in revealing Himself by such names suited to the operations which he has set forth in Scripture concerning himself, and in declaring the relations he bears to his creatures, he has manifested a wisdom as great as his condescension. The name *אלהים* *Aleim* no more expresses Deity than the terms Father, Husband, Master, do Humanity.

† Jehovah determined that the great end for which he had established his most holy and righteous Law should be accomplished, viz. that its precepts should be fulfilled, and in case of disobedience that its penalty should be suffered. Messiah undertook to do both. Thus therefore the matter stood.

Messiah—Jehovah אל—The Law. Messiah and the Law stood in opposition. Jehovah was by Covenant engagements Mediator אל. He claimed respect for his Law, and enforced the penalty when it was

ation and Mediator in the person of Messiah, Jehovah's Servant and Prophet.

Jehovah—Messiah לֵאמֹר—The Elect. The Elect having incurred Jehovah's wrath by disobedience to his Law, were obnoxious to his just and righteous vengeance. No one could redeem himself or his brother. Messiah, the one Mediator לֵאמֹר according to Covenant engagements with Jehovah, to satisfy the demands of the broken Law, came in the flesh and reconciled Jehovah by fulfilling the Law, and reconciles the Elect to Jehovah's plan of Redemption by shewing the suitableness of his work to satisfy Jehovah in repairing the breach of his Law. By Man the Law was violated. By Man all the demands of all the Laws are made good: for by the One Mediator, the Man Jesus Christ, Jehovah's Law is satisfied.* As they are unable to stipulate on their own behalf, they need to be told that as אֱלֹהִים *One who covenants* on their behalf with Him who afterwards took upon him the seed of the woman, He has fully secured their everlasting happiness. As also by being אֱלֹהִים, *One engaged by Covenant to provide and support the Surety who should undertake to discharge the debt of pains and penalties incur-*

violated: for the Law was made for the government of Man, and when broken by him, man was required to repair the breach. This Messiah performed. He magnified Jehovah's Law and made it honourable by doing and suffering all its will: and so in keeping all its precepts and submitting to all its penalties, He redeemed them who were under the curse of the Law, being made a curse for them. Jehovah upheld him in life, raised him from the grave, placed him at his right hand, and hath given him a kingdom and dominion of which there shall be no end. See Ps. cxix. 122.

* In Ezek. xxviii. 2, 9, the prince of Tyre assumed the title of אֱלֹהִים, or the Vicegerent of Jehovah on earth. The heathen Emperors did the same in their time, as each Pope continues to do in his day. אֱלֹהִים, Deus, Dominus, Divus, and Deus, are on these occasions strictly synonymous, and mean no more than the proud assumption of that exalted character which belongs to Him who is to establish the Fifth and Last Monarchy on the Earth, who is the King of kings and Lord of lords, to whom is given an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and a kingdom which shall not be destroyed.

red by the breach of the Law, the plan of redemption is not only ordered in all things but sure. Yet none of these names set forth Jehovah's Essence. They only declare his Covenant-relations to the Church, or *what* he is to sinners saved by Grace.

41. The self-contradicting doctrine of the *Eternal Generation* of the Son of God, which was unknown to the Christian Church during the first three Centuries, and which Petrus Galatinus says was the invention of the Apostate Jews, has confounded the Christian verity more than any other heresy that has infested the Church of Christ. It received an unexpected confirmation by a misinterpretation of the word *Persona* by Christians of more modern times. They attributed to it the sense of a particular individual or corporeal existence, instead of a character or office, and so made that a name expressive of the Essence of the First Cause, which was intended to declare his manner of action only. Of this doctrine the Heathens have no trace in their First Cause.* When the Fathers of the Christian Church adopted it, in their attempts to explain the mystery of the Trinity, they sank the person of the Holy Ghost altogether. *Tertullian*, speaking upon this subject, gives the comparison of Fire, Splendor, Light. *Prudentius*, of Light, Heat, Comfort. *Augustine* of Motion, Light, Heat. *Clemens Alexandrinus*, of the Sun and Light only. And at a later date, *Petrus Galatinus*, of the Sun's globe, ray, and Light. In none of these are there any vestige of the Spirit. Lord King on the Apostle's Creed says, "As for the manner of the Father's Eternal begetting of the Son, there are various similitudes used by the Ancients to help our conceptions therein, as that the Father begat the Son, as a Fountain doth

* Man cannot be made acquainted with that of which his senses can have no knowledge. But

The senses can have no knowledge of pure Spirit. Ergo,

Man cannot be made acquainted with pure Spirit. or The Essence of the First Cause which is pure Spirit must be unknown to us.

her Streams, and the Sun Light, and a Root the Branches, and several others such like: but whether all of them will abide a strict scrutiny, I shall not here inquire: only this I shall venture to affirm, That none of them do yield us any adequate or satisfactory apprehension of this sublime mystery. For which reason great caution is to be used in our searches thereinto, and expressions thereof, that we do not with too great nicety and curiosity dive into this profound and incomprehensible secret, lest while we endeavor to shew our learning and knowledge we betray our ignorance, and what is worse, conceive and utter things unbecoming the Divine and Infinite Majesty."

42. It is most probable that the doctrine of *Eternal Generation* arose from the word *Eternal* being taken in the sense of perpetual duration à parte antè as well as à parte post. When man would in thought enter upon the subject of *Eternity*, i. e. what is without beginning and without end, he is lost. His ideas are of necessity relative, and respect some measure of duration. When he would think of existence before time, he cannot comprehend what it is. His ideas can extend no further than some beginning of operation. He cannot go a step beyond that without losing himself in the inextricable mazes of conjecture.

Eternity is usually defined to be that which is without beginning, end, or succession. There is no Scripture which relates to the first part of this definition. Ps. xc. 2.—ciii. 17, have no reference to it. In fact there is No Thing without beginning. And if there be No Thing then there can be no word, and consequently no word in the Hebrew tongue to denote it, as words are the representatives of things. As far as the last part of the definition relates to Man it is equally inaccurate. It is true that the revolutions of the heavenly bodies by which years are numbered; or time is now measured will cease, when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, but a succession, or a repetition of Times similar in duration to such as had occur-

red to each individual, will again and again take place in unceasing order. And this is the true meaning of the word **Eternity**.*

To the Bible student by whom the above views are considered to be founded in truth, enough has been said. As many as are averse to them cannot but have felt, if they have not expressed, a weariness in attending to the statements already made. The Author would therefore add nothing more, but close his subject with adding the words of a sincere, however ill informed writer of the last Century.

“ Reader,

“ If in perusing this Book you have discovered any truth you did not before understand, it is my earnest request, you would rather lay it up in your heart for your own use, than make it the subject of contention and strife, the fuel of party zeal, or the occasion of despising, or censuring those who do not yet see it. And if you should enter into discourse about it, let it be with all moderation and coolness on your part, in the spirit of peace and mutual forbearance. And therefore never converse upon this or any other point with an angry man; passion and heat blind the judgment: nor with a *bigot*, who is determined for a scheme, and resolved to open his eyes to no further evidence. And whenever anger and bigotry appear in a conversation already begun, break it off: For you cannot proceed to any good purpose, and will be in danger of catching a spirit which is quite contrary to the Gospel. **HOLD THE TRUTH IN LOVE.** Fear God, and keep his commandments: despise earthly things: restrain and regulate your passions, be constant in reading the Scriptures, fervent in prayer to God, kind and compassionate to all men, punctual and cheerful in every duty, humble in all your deportment, upright and honest in all your dealings, tempe-

* Parkhurst on *πῶς*, *Time*, &c. has these derivations: *ÆT*-us, *time*, *age*, whence *ÆT*-ernus, *ÆT*-ernitus, *ET*-ernal, *ET*-ernity. Junius on *Eternal* says, *Ævum* is *æon*. So, according to Priscian, is *Ævitas*, *Ætas*, from *Ævum*, as also *Æviternus*, *Æternus*.

rate and sober in all your enjoyments, patient under all afflictions, watchful against every temptation, and zealous in every good work : And then with joy look for the Coming of our LORD JESUS CHRIST for he will assuredly appear to your everlasting Salvation."

THE END.









